ANTIQUITY the certain Guide in RELIGION:

OR, THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Eternal Generation

OF THE

Second Perſon in the adorable TRINITY, conſider'd:

AND THE

Abſurdity and *Inconſiſtency* of believing an *eternal, ſelf-exiſtent Perſon* to be *Begotten*, is plainly demonſtrated.

By PHILALETHES, a ſtrict *Trinitarian*.

After the Way which they call Hereſy, ſo worſhip I the God of my Fathers. Acts xxiv. 14.

—— *Let me not I pray you, accept any Man's Perſon, neither let me give flattering Titles unto Man.* Job xxii. 21.

—— *And above all Things put on Charity, which is the Bond of Perfectneſs.* Coloſſ. iii. 14.

Ἕνα καὶ μόνον εἶναι Θεὸν, πᾶσιν ὅτι τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεοσεβείας γνώρισμα. Juſtin Martyr.

LONDON:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*. [Price Six-pence.]

The PREFACE.

IT is the general Practice of all those who embrace an Opinion in Religion, more for the Countenance which the ancient Writers *and* Fathers *of the Church have given to it, than the current Testimony of divine Revelation doth, immediately, on the Advancement of any thing which is opposite to what the* Fathers *in general have maintain'd, or their Admirers have prepossess'd themselves withal, to cry out,* Heresy! *and to load the* unfather'd *Doctrine with all the bad Names that Envy, Prejudice, or Self-Conceit can invent.*

It has thus happen'd amongst some, in regard to those who have of late in London *deny'd that an eternal, self-existent Person, could have his Personality generated or communicated. My former Pamphlet, which I publish'd on this Subject, has met with the Usage I expected,* viz. *Calumny and Reproach, tho' it hath been publish'd but about three or four Months: But I am very easy on this Account, because I am well assur'd, that none but the* Inconsiderate, *who have nothing but* Noise *and a long Train of* Fathers *and* Schoolmen *to produce for what they assert, will treat any Author, be he* who *or* what *he will, with Contempt, (or Praise either) without an impartial Enquiry into the Reasonableness of what he advances.*

I much fear that both in my former and in this Pamphlet, many will misconstrue my Terms, *and way of expressing myself, concerning the* Son *of God, by not giving themselves Liberty to consider my Scope and Intent thro' the whole treat-*

ing of the Subject; which is, to diſprove the Notion of Perſonality being begot or communicated, and to prove that Chriſt is Son *only as Mediator; and therefore, when I ſay the* Son was not Eternal, *I mean no more, than that the Second Perſon did not eternally exiſt in the Union of the two Natures, and therefore was not eternally a Son; or he that* is *the Son, exiſted not eternally in that Relation. Thus again; when I deny that he that is the Image of God, was as eternal as God; I mean not as to his Perſon, for that* was *ſo eternal; but I mean with Relation to his being* the Image; *he was not eternally* the Image: *And when I ſay the* Son *is not* eternal *or* ſelf-exiſtent, *I mean not, that the Perſon ſo ſtil'd is not ſelf-exiſtent, but that, in* that Relation, *he is not ſo; in the Relation of a diſtinct Perſon in God, he is ſelf-exiſtent; but the Nature of his Sonſhip, or being begotten, was not ſelf-exiſtent,* i. e. *he exiſted not as the Son from a Neceſſity of his divine Nature, which he did as God. Again; when I aſſert in my former Pamphlet, Page* 17, that the Son as ſuch is not truly and properly God, *I mean not that the Perſon, who by Virtue of being in Union with Humanity, is the Son, is not truly and properly God; but that his Sonſhip ariſes not from his divine Nature only, but from both human and divine united; and therefore in the Relation of a Son, or as Chriſt is Son, he is not to be conſider'd as truly and properly God only, without the Manhood in Union; tho' that Union makes the Second Perſon nevertheleſs truly and properly God. In fine, whenever I ſpeak of the Son in a diminutive way, I reſpect*

not, nor have any Eye to him ſimply conſider'd as an eternal Perſon in the Godhead, but as having Humanity in Union; which is in a Senſe, in which he is not ſimply God, but Man and God united. Wherefore it will, I hope be obſerv'd, that as I confine Sonſhip, or Chriſt's being the Son of God, *to his Mediatorſhip,* i. e. *to his having two Natures in one Perſon: In all the Senſes, the Mediator, conſider'd in that Relation as Man and God, may be ſaid to be inferior to the Father, in the ſame Views I aſſert the Son to be inferior.*

This way of treating the Sonſhip of Chriſt is frequently ſtil'd Arianiſm, Socianianiſm, *or* Sabellianiſm; *tho' not one of the Charges can be prov'd. And I muſt take upon me to tell thoſe who pretend to fix it on any one of theſe, that they are either ignorant of the Scheme of theſe who deny* Eternal Generation, *and yet hold a Co-equality and Co-eternity of three Perſons, or elſe they are unacquainted with the Sentiments of* Arius, Socinus, *or* Sabellius *upon the Trinity.* Arius (*if I am not miſinform'd by Orthodox Writers*) *held with a Trinity of Perſons, but deny'd their abſolute Co-equality and Co-eternity one with another,* i. e. *as Perſons. Whether the* Eternal Generationiſts, *or thoſe who deny that Doctrine, and yet hold a ſtrict Co-equality of Perſons, have moſt ſeeming Right to the Charge of* Arianiſm; *I ſay which have the moſt Right, will appear from a Quotation from two Authors who were* Eternal Generationiſts. *The firſt ſhall be Mr.* John Norton, *of* New-England. *In his* Orthodox Evangeliſt, *Page* 24. *he hath theſe expreſs Words.* 'A perſonal Act is the

'divine Eſſence, (or God) working eternally 'and neceſſarily upon itſelf. The firſt way of 'the divine Eſſence acting upon itſelf, produ-'ceth the firſt Perſon. The ſecond way of its 'acting upon itſelf, produceth the ſecond Per-'ſon. The third way of its acting or working 'upon itſelf, produceth the third Perſon.' *Here's a bright Diſcovery of the Myſtery of the Trinity according to an* Eternal Generationiſt! *And this way of treating the Trinity, ſeems to have a Twang both of* Sabellianiſm *and* Arianiſm. *For in the firſt place it ſuppoſes one undivided Eſſence, which is called God, to exiſt as ſuch, previous to any Perſonality at all. Tho' this is not directly* Sabellianiſm, *yet it ſavours a little of it, and but a little, being over-mix'd with* Arianiſm; *for it ſuppoſes the Father or firſt Perſon produced by a* firſt *Act, and the* ſecond, *by a ſecond Act; and therefore of Neceſſity the ſecond Perſon cannot be co-eternal with the firſt. But I wonder this Author did not, to defend Co-eternity, ſuppoſe the divine Eſſence to produce all three Perſons at one Act: But I gueſs he puzzled his Brains, and ranſack'd his old muſty* Fathers *in his Study,* ſufficiently, *to bring the above Scheme forth, and when it was once midwif'd into Exiſtence, he thought he would trouble his Head no farther to make it more feaſible. However, what I quoted him for is, to ſhew that* Arianiſm *is a Charge which ſuits an* Eternal Generationiſt *better than a ſtrict* Trinitarian *who denies the Doctrine. And this Scheme of the Eſſence acting upon itſelf, muſt certainly be agreed with by every one who aſſerts* Father *and* Son *to be eternal, divine* eſſential *Characters;*

ters; *or that* Eternal Generation *is an immanent eſſential Act of God. A ſecond Author, whom I would quote, to ſhew that the* Eternal Generationiſts *have ſeemingly a Right to Charge of* Arianiſm, *is the late Reverend Divine Mr.* Joſeph Huſſey: *In his* Glory of Chriſt unveil'd, *Page* 569. *he hath theſe expreſs Words,* 'Myſti-'cal Adoption is an Act of God the Father, and 'as the Father is firſt in *Subſiſtence* before the 'other Perſons, ſo he is firſt in *Operation* before 'the other two.' *Or as* Norton, *in* his *Book, Page* 25. *ſays,* 'He is the firſt in the Order of 'the Original of the Perſons.' *Who are the likeſt* Arians *who deny Co-eternity, let every judicious Reader judge; they who ſay that the Father was firſt in* Subſiſtence *before the other two Perſons, or we who aſſert that all the three Perſons in God from a Neceſſity of Nature eternally exiſted as they uow do, and that one was not produced or firſt in Subſiſtence before another.*

As to the Charge of Socinianiſm, *it hardly deſerves Regard. Since we own and acknowledge that neither the miraculous Conception of the Man by the Virgin, nor the Glory of a Man rais'd to any peculiar Houours or Dignities, which ſuppoſe him to be but a mere Man, can ever be ſufficient ground for Chriſt being called* God's only Son, *&c. but that the Perſon who has the Humanity in Union is truly and properly God, and that as thus united, as poſſeſs'd by the Father* before his Works of old, Prov. viii. *he was God's* Own, firſt begotten Son. *Again,*

This Scheme of Chriſt's Sonſhip only as Mediator, is as far from Sabellius's *Notion, as the* Eaſt

East *is from the* West. *He ſuppos'd only* one Perſon *in the Godhead, bearing three diſtinct Relations to his People. But I frankly acknowledge three eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſons, co-equal in all Circumſtances, who as they are thus ſimply conſider'd, not one was perſonally begotten or produc'd by another. And tho' the Terms* Father, Son, *&c. are not eſſential to the Perſons from an abſolute Neceſſity of their divine Nature, yet the Perſons who bear theſe Characters are diſtinct infinitely eternal, and ſelf-exiſtent Perſons.*

There are various Repetitions of my Meaning in this Pamphlet, concerning the Doctrine of Sonſhip, *and three in one; but that will be thought excuſable, if it is conſider'd, how apt many are to conclude from* this *and the* other *Mode of Expreſſion which I uſe, that I acknowledge not Co-equality and Co-eternity, and therefore a frequent Repetition is abſolutely neceſſary, and almoſt unavoidable.*

As to Antiquity and the Fathers, *which ſome plead ſo much for in Relation to the Doctrine of* Eternal Generation, *it is all Pretence; for if any one will read the learned Dr.* Edwards's Diſcourſe of the ancient Writers of the Church*, *he will find that the Fathers, in general, themſelves vaſtly diſagreed in their Sentiments on the Trinity, and are not to be rely'd on as knowing more of* Chriſtianity *than their Succeſſors. For, ſays he,* 'Even the two firſt Ages of 'the Church produc'd ſome of the groſſeſt He-'reticks of all; and ſome of them that writ 'againſt theſe Errors, were erroneous them-

* In his Book call'd, *The Remains*, &c.

'ſelves;'

'ſelves;' *and in another Page he tells us, that* 'It is plain that they (*i. e.* the *Fathers*) themſelves 'corrupted the Purity of the Chriſtian Faith, and 'fell into palpable Errors.' *And as to the* firſt *Chriſtian Writers, the Doctor tells us we can expect nothing from* them *ſatisfactory, concerning the* Trinity; *however, he obſerves, that* 'the Terms they us'd were ſometimes 'ambiguous, and they ſeem not to underſtand them 'themſelves.' *In fine, the Doctor abſolutely affirms,* 'that they are of no Uſe to determine our Opinions, 'and to ſettle our Perſuaſions.'

Whence it is plain, that to quote the Fathers for this and for the other Doctrine is trifling, ſince they writ ſo ambiguouſly, that all Perſuaſions (as we find they do) may eaſily quote Antiquity for what they advance. The Fathers having run themſelves into ſome of the Whims which the Papiſts hold with at this Time, particularly as to a Purgatory, Praying for the Dead, Praying to Saints, the Wine in the Euchariſt, *&c. All which Dr.* Edwards *expreſly tells us, was advanced by the Fathers. Why then is there ſuch a Rout about the Fathers? eſpecially amongſt the Diſſenters, who pretend to a Liberty of thinking and judging as highly requiſite for every particular Perſon; and that no Impoſition of Faith from any one ſhould be laid on Chriſtians. But it is too evident, that many of theſe who are for free Liberty in Matters of Religion, make a very great Stir, when any oppoſes* them; *it is very apparent that they love to rule the Roaſt as well as their Neighbours. But this by the Bye. There are ſeveral Fathers which might be quoted particularly* Tertullian, *as denying the Doctrine of* Eternal Generation, *but I really don't think it worth while to mind any thing they have ſaid, as worthy to be brought for Confirmers or Eſtabliſhers of an Argument. However, if great Titles and learned Divines will give Sanction to an Opinion; the late learned Dr.* Ridgley, *I find, ſince I writ my laſt Pamphlet, having never ſeen him before, is entirely of my Opinion in this Point; as*

was

was the late Dr. Anderſon, *Earl of* Buchan's *Chaplain, who I find has pretty much follow'd Mr.* Ridgley.

I have now only two Things to deſire, and ſo I conclude my Preface.

1. *That if this Treatiſe, with the former, ſhould be anſwered by any, perſonal Reflections may be omitted.*

2. *That thoſe who anſwer me would give an explicit Definition of their Meaning in the Terms* ETERNAL GENERATION, *and would ſhew how that Doctrine claſhes not with the Co-equality and Co-eternity of the Perſon, whoſe Perſonality was begotten, with the Perſon his Begetter; in doing which, an Obligation to them, will indeed be laid on*

PHILALETHES.

The following *Errata*, which in my former Pamphlet on this Subject, eſcap'd Obſervation, are deſir'd to be corrected as follow.

IN the Preface, *Page* 1. *for* Sybellians, *read* Sabellians; as likewiſe in *P.* 52. *P.* 24. *for* χαραχτὴς, *read* χαραχτὴρ. *P.* 37. *for* ἐνδιάθετον, *read* ἐνδιάθετον. *P.* 39. *for* ther of which, *read* another of which. *P.* 40. *for* Filitation, *read* Filiation. *P.* 48. *for* I ſay, *read* I ſaw. *P.* 51. *for* Belteſhazzar, *read* Belſhazzar; *and for* Heaven, *read* Heavens. *P. ult. for* Verſe, *read* Verſes. And in this Pamphlet, *Page* 8. *for* the Chriſt, *read* that Chriſt. *P.* 22. *for* allow'd, *read* be allow'd. *P.* 24. *for* cou'd be not, *read* cou'd not be. *P.* 52. *for* better more, *read* better and more.

INTRO-

ANTIQUITY no *certain* Guide in RELIGION, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

BEFORE I enter, upon what I more immediately deſign to proſecute, in this Continuation of my Arguments againſt the Doctrine of the *Eternal Generation* of one of the Divine Perſons in the Godhead; it may be as proper now, as it was in my former Pamphlet, to ſhew what are the main Poſitions or Aſſertions, both of the negative and affirmative Side of the Queſtion. By what I can collect from thoſe Writers who have ſpoke of the Point, and have peremptorily aſſerted *Eternal Generation*, I find the whole ſeems to amount to this; *that the eternal Father, eternally begat the eternal Son*; or, *that one of the eternal Perſons in the Godhead was eternally begotten by another*; who by ſome is ſtil'd the firſt Perſon. Now, tho' I abſolutely deny all this, yet I acknowledge with all my Soul, that the Perſons who ſuſtain the Characters of Father and Son, were infinite, co-equal and co-eternal. And, as I think, by Scripture Authority, I entirely confine Chriſt's Sonſhip to the Mediatorſhip; and aſſert, that if one of the Perſons in

Godhead is called the begotten Son of God, it muſt relate to his perſonal Union to the Humanity: For let the Idea of begotten or brought forth, be never ſo largely extended, it will ſtill fall ſhort of expreſſing the Glory of an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon. Eternity and Self-exiſtency, carry an Idea (almoſt) infinitely above thoſe low Terms of being *generated*, *ſet up*, *brought forth*, and the like.

A noted Author expreſſes his Ideas on *Eternal Generation* in this manner, "It is (ſays he) "a Communication of his (*i. e.* the Father's) "undivided Eſſence in the perſonal Subſiſtence "of the Son; (or in plain Words (ſays he) "Matter of *Faith*, not of Inveſtigation by "proud and ſaucy Reaſon." *) And yet this learned Man owns, in another Place, that "the incommunicable Life, is as proper *to*, "and *in* the Son, as it is proper *to* and *in* the "*Father*" †. Which to my Apprehenſion, is abſolutely impoſſible; for the Father's Life was not *communicated*, but by his own Conceſſion the Son's was; wherefore it is evident, that the Father's Life was proper to him, as *incommunicated*, (which is certainly a Property of Deity only) but the Son's is proper to him as *communicated* by the Father: For Mr. *Huſſey* immediately quotes *John* v. 26. *As the Father hath Life in himſelf*, (which certainly was given to him by no other) *ſo hath he given the Son to have Life in himſelf*. Whence it is perſpicuous, that the Son's Life is not eſſen-

* See Mr. *Huſſey*'s Glory of Chriſt unveil'd, pag. 54.
† Page 98.

tially

tially the ſame with the Father's; becauſe the one was *communicated* or *given*, and the other was not; but "Its a Matter of Faith," (ſays the great Man.) If ſo, Why did he offer to explain that which is to be believ'd without Explanation? Firſt Mr. *Huſſey* offers to define Eternal Generation, by ſaying, "It is a com-"munication of the Father's undivided Eſ-"ſence, &c." And immediately afterwards, tells us, "It is a Matter of *Faith*, and not of "Inveſtigation by proud and ſaucy Reaſon." Why then did this great Man go about by reaſonable Terms to inveſtigate this Myſtery? For all the World at the firſt View, underſtands the Meaning of one Perſon's *communicating* one thing to another; and therefore if *Eternal Generation* be a Communication, &c. we have found out the Myſtery, and are come to a right Underſtanding of the Thing, which to me ſeems this; that Eternal Generation is *communicating* to the Son or Second Perſon, what eternally he had not: For Communication certainly denotes a giving what was not always enjoy'd. But the learned Dr. *Owen* expreſſes himſelf more full and explicit on this profound Myſtery. "Now the *Son* (ſays he) "*receives all from the Father*, and the Father "nothing from the Son. Whatever belongs "unto the Perſon of the Son, as the Perſon "of the Son, he receives it all from the Fa-"ther by eternal Generation; for *as the Fa-"ther hath Life in himſelf, ſo hath he given "unto the Son* to have Life in himſelf, *John* "v. 26. He is therefore the *eſſential Image*

" of the Father, becauſe all the Properties of " the divine Nature, are communicated unto " him, together with Perſonality from the " Father.*" From this great and good Man's Words, I think this Argument is fairly deducible; that if the Son's Perſonality be communicated, and the Father's is not, then the Son is not co-equal with the Father. And here let it be remark'd, who give the *Arians*, who deny Co-equality and Co-eternity, moſt Handle, we by ſaying the Son's Perſonality was *unbegotten*, *uncreated*, *uncommunicated*, and that Sonſhip relates to begetting Chriſt as the Mediator, or the *Eternal Generationiſts*, who ſay, that as a divine Perſon in the Trinity, the Son of God was begotten, and that his Perſonality and all he hath was given and communicated by the Father to him. Who are got in *Arianiſm*, and know nothing of it, they or we? Again, the Dr. in the 14th Page of the ſame Treatiſe on the Perſon of Chriſt, tells us, " That Chriſt's " diſtinct Perſonality and Subſiſtence was by " an internal, eternal Act of the Divine *Being* " in the Perſon of the Father, or eternal Ge- " neration, which is eſſential unto the divine " Eſſence, whereby nothing anew was out- " wardly wrought, or did exiſt." What Ideas the Doctor had concerning *Eternal Generation* being eſſential to God, I really can't take upon me to ſay; but if I apprehend the Term *eſſential*, when apply'd to God, aright, I humbly conceive it means every thing, without which the Divine Being cannot exiſt: And likewiſe,

* See his Treatiſe on the Perſon of Chriſt, pag. 33.

that all things eſſential to God will be, what they eternally were, and now are, to endleſs Ages the ſame. Wherefore, if the Act of Generation be *eſſential to the divine Eſſence*, the Act is ſtill performing, and the Son of neceſſity not begotten.

Here I would have it obſerv'd; That I acknowledge, that as the three divine Perſons have manifeſted themſelves, in the Relations which they bear in the Oeconomy of Salvation, under the Characters of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, under theſe Titles the Perſons may and ought to be divinely worſhipped: Becauſe, when we worſhip, we reverence Perſons, not Relations; the Perſons who ſuſtain theſe Characters, are the ſole Object of our religious Worſhip: And tho' the Sonſhip is more than a Relation, yet the divine Second Perſon, who ſubſiſts in the upoſtatical Union is relatively, not *eſſentially* as God, a Son. But we ſhall treat the Subject, in this Pamphlet, under the following Heads.

I. We ſhall ſhew, that many other Texts, which are quoted for *Eternal Generation*, prove nothing of the Point, no more than thoſe inſtanced in our former Pamphlet.

II. We ſhall diſtinctly ſhew, that ſome dangerous Conſequences attend the Doctrine.

III. We ſhall quote ſome Texts, which manifeſtly prove our Aſſertion, *viz.* that Chriſt is the Son only as Mediator.

IV. We ſhall endeavour to manifeſt, that the Co-eternity and Co-equality of three divine, diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead, may more eaſily be prov'd without the Doctrine of *Eternal Generation*, than with it.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Texts brought for Eternal Generation, proved to have no Relation to it.

IT would be endleſs to quote all the Texts univerſally, which every eternal Generationiſt may think, gives Weight to his Hypotheſis: And therefore, I have in this, as well as in my former Treatiſe, choſen ſuch as I have either read in Authors, or imagine might ſeem to them to favour the Doctrine the moſt. I have taken Notice in my former Treatiſe of twelve Texts, I have likewiſe inſtanced in this, eleven more; all which are generally, I apprehend, thought as Bulwarks. We begin here then with the following.

Inſt. 1. 1 John v. 20. *And we know, that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding, that we may know him that is true; And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God and eternal Life.*

All that poſſibly can be drawn from this Text is, that Jeſus Chriſt is the true God. It may be objected, that the Son is here aſſerted to be the true God, and therefore the Son, as Son was co-eternal with the Perſon of the Father.

Anſw. I acknowledge now, and always have, that the Perſon who ſuſtains the Character of Son, is the true God; and in the Re-

lation

lation of a Divine Perſon in the Godhead, is co-eternal with the Father's Perſon; but I abſolutely deny, that as Son, he is co-equal and co-eternal with the Perſon, who ſuſtains the Title of Father, *i. e.* tho' as a Perſon in God the Mediator was eternal, yet as Son or in the Relation of Mediator, he was not eternal. And for theſe Reaſons.

1. Becauſe this Text evidently ſhews, that by the Word *Son*, Mediatorſhip is meant; *and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt.* Now certainly none will ſay, that the Divine Second Perſon, abſtractly taken in that Relation is Jeſus Chriſt? or in other Words, the Meſſiah, the ſent-anointed Saviour? (as the Terms *Jeſus Chriſt* ſignify) I ſay, as none will aſſert this; becauſe, the Mediator, Jeſus Chriſt contains two Natures, and the Divine Second Perſon in that Relation only, has but one undivided Nature: Therefore, I think I may fairly draw from the Words, *even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt*, the following Argument: If the Son be the Mediator or Jeſus Chriſt, the Son cannot be as eternal a God, becauſe the Mediator is not; but the Son is expreſsly called Jeſus Chriſt or the Mediator; therefore the Son in that Capacity, cannot have been eternal as God is, becauſe the Mediator is not ſo eternal. I think this is a ſolid Argument, to prove that the Son here ſpoken of cannot mean diſtinctly the Divine Second Perſon in the Trinity in that Relation, but muſt refer to the Mediatorſhip; or, that as Mediator, Chriſt is only *the Son.*

2. Another Reaſon, that the Son here ſpoke of cannot refer to the Second Perſon, ſimply as a Divine Perſon in the Godhead, and in that Relation only conſidered, but muſt refer to the Mediator, who has two Natures in one Perſon, is, becauſe this Son is ſaid to have *come: The Son of God is come.* Now as an eternal infinite Perſon, it is abſolutely impoſſible the Chriſt ſhould come and go; perhaps it may be reply'd, that as Mediator the Son came? — I believe it; and as Mediator he was the Son, and no otherwiſe; for the Text expreſsly ſays, the *Son is come*, &c. and that we may know what this Son who came, is; the Scripture goes on to explain it, and tells us that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the Son; *even, in his Son Jeſus Chriſt.* For tho' the *Son*, (ſuppoſing him in that Capacity to be diſtinctly the Second eternal Perſon in the Godhead) I ſay, tho' the eternal Second Perſon, by Virtue of the Hypoſtatical Union, might perſonally be the Mediator; yet the Mediator cannot be the Son, *i. e.* If we conſider *Son* to relate to Chriſt, merely as a diſtinct Perſon in God; becauſe in the Idea of Mediator, two Natures are always conſider'd; but in the Idea of the Second Perſon in the Trinity, one undivided Nature is only conſider'd. Wherefore tho' the Son may be call'd the Mediator, yet the Mediator cannot be call'd the *Son*, i. e. if Son ſtrictly relates to Chriſt as God. But what further proves that this *Son*, in the Text, cannot be merely the eternal Second Perſon, is becauſe Believers are ſaid to be *in* this Son; *we are in him that is true*; *in his Son Jeſus Chriſt.*

We,

We, &c. *i. e.* We Believers are in the Son as our Head; he is the Head, we the Members, and as our Head he has given us an Underſtanding to know himſelf by. Is it poſſible now to conceive, that the Saints have the *Son* for their Head, if as *Son* he is diſtinctly (without relation to Mediatorſhip) One eternal Perſon in God? Is an abſolute infinite Jehovah the Saints containing Head? for as an eternal Perſon in God, he is thus abſolute: No, ſurely; the Mediator as *God-man*, is the Believers only myſtical Head, from whom they can alone receive Underſtanding to know *him* that is true.

Inſt. 2. John iii. 16. *God ſo lov'd the World, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life.* That this Text cannot relate to the eternal Second Perſon, in that Relation only conſidered (as the *eternal* Son is ſaid to be) appears from the following Conſiderations.

1. This *Son* is ſaid to be given as an Effect of God's Love; *God ſo loved the World, that he gave*, &c. Now if the Son, as ſuch, was conſidered as diſtinctly an eternal Perſon in God, it was impoſſible he ſhould be given by another Perſon, with whom he is co-equal, co-eternal, and co-eſſential; for one Perſon in the Godhead, taken in that Relation only, has not the leaſt Prerogative over another; which he that gives any thing, muſt have over his Gift. If it is ſaid, the Second Perſon was given as Mediator; I reply, that as Mediator, then he is the Son, for as Son he is given; *gave his only-*

only-begotten Son: And as Mediator, God the Father had a Prerogative to give the Lord Jeſus; or to make him his Salvation, and Meſſenger to his People: But if the *Son* was the eternal Second Perſon, in *that* Relation only, I ſay again, the Firſt Perſon had no Prerogative to give him: But as he was the Father's *only-begotten*, by Virtue of the Hypoſtatical Union, *he* had from that Conſideration, a Right to diſpoſe of his Son, in as much as by Virtue of the Paternal Relation, he was ſuperior to him.

2. This *Son* here ſaid to be *given*, cannot be the eternal Second Perſon in the Godhead in that view only; becauſe he is here propoſed as the Object of our divine Truſt and Reliance on for eternal Life, which if as Son, he is in Relation only of Second Perſon in the Trinity, he cannot be; for in that Relation with the other two Perſons, he is an abſolute God: And none will dare to ſay that they rely on Chriſt as an abſolute God, without his Relation to them as their Mediator. But the Son is here plainly propoſed as the Object of our divine Reliance on for Salvation, and therefore as Son, he is not the Second Perſon as an abſolute God: Which according to the *Generationiſts* Scheme, he muſt be.

I muſt here give a Caution, leſt my laſt Obſervation may be miſtaken: Obſerve; I do not ſay that the Deity of Chriſt is not the Ground of our Reliance on Chriſt as Mediator for Salvation; but I ſay his Deity only, *i. e.* his being in the Relation merely as Second Perſon in the Trinity, is not the Ground of our

Truſt

Truſt on him for Salvation; but this Deity in Union with the Humanity, or in the Relation of Mediator, as ſuch, he is the Object of our divine Truſt and Reliance upon for eternal Salvation; but according to the eternal Generationiſts, the Second Perſon in the Godhead, in that Relation only, is the Object of our Hope for Salvation: For they tell us that the Son as ſuch, is the Object of our Truſt, and they tell us at the ſame time that his Sonſhip has Relation only to his particular divine Perſonality; the Conſequence of which is, that the divine Second Perſon in God merely ſo conſidered, is the Object of our Truſt for Salvation, and not as he is our Mediator.

Inſt. 3. John iii. 36. *He that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting Life; and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee Life; but the Wrath of God abideth on him.*

Object. If the Son, as Son, was not a divine Perſon, co-eternal with the Perſon of the Father, the Curſe here, would never have been denounced on thoſe that do not believe him.

Anſw. This Objection is anſwered, by what has been ſaid under the laſt Inſtance. It is granted without any Demur, that the *Son*, or the Perſon ſo called, is an eternal Perſon, co-equal with the Perſon bearing the Character of *Father*; but he was an eternal Perſon before he bore the Character of Son, which Sonſhip ariſes from the Hypoſtatical Union, and in this Relation of Son he cannot be co-eternal with the Perſon, his Begetter: As a Perſon in God he was co-eternal with *him*, that begot him to his Mediatorſhip,

Mediatorſhip, but in the Senſe he is begotten, he cannot be eternal as his Begetter was, *i. e.* Chriſt's Generation was not, nor can be eternal as God is. And that this *Son* cannot relate to the Second Perſon merely in that Relation, appears from the 35th Ver. of this Chap. which immediately preceeds the above Inſtance: *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand*, &c. In the Relation of an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon, the Son could not poſſibly receive any thing of him, that by begetting him was his Father; but as he was begotten, or as he was the *beloved Son* of God, he did receive; therefore as the beloved Son he was not merely the Second Perſon in God, but the Mediator. It might be much to our Profit, carefully at all times to conſider, that our Redeemer bears two Relations: (1.) As an infinite ſelf-exiſtent Perſon in the Godhead; and (2.) as the Mediator of the Covenant, *i. e.* by Virtue of being hypoſtatically united to the Humanity. Now in the firſt Relation, he can receive nothing from another Perſon in the Godhead; but in the Second he can, and does receive all things from his Father; which ſtill ſtrengthens the Argument againſt Chriſt's eſſential Filiation as God: For he that is an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon, in that Relation, cannot receive any thing; but the Son receives; therefore the Son, as ſuch, is not eternal, nor ſelf-exiſtent.

Inſt. 4. Mat. xi. 27. *And no Man knoweth the Son, but the Father: Neither knoweth any Man the Father, ſave the Son, and he to whom-*

whomſoever the Son will reveal him. Why the Knowledge, which the Father has of the Son, ſhould ſignify his knowing him by eternal Generation, (as ſome ſay he does) is to me very ſtrange; for the Text ſpeaks not of the Son in the Relation of an eternal ſelf-exiſtent independent Perſon only, to which the *eternal Generationiſts* confine Sonſhip; but it evidently ſpeaks of the Mediator, and by the Son means *him* in that Capacity; for it expreſsly ſays of the Son, that *all things are delivered to him of the Father*, (which could never be (as has been proved before) if in the Relation of Son he was eternally independent, for it is as Son only that he receives). But it follows; *And no Man (or no one) knoweth the Son, but the Father*, i. e. none knoweth the ſame Son who received all things by Generation, as his Father who begat him does; or no one knows the Nature of his Sonſhip, but he that ſaid to him, *Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee.* To this I have heard it from the Pulpit, of late, objected by an eternal Generationiſt; that in our Senſe of Sonſhip, every one knoweth the Son, *i. e.* (ſay they) "every one knows him to be the "Mediator, conſiſting of two Natures Divine "and Human." To this I may very juſtly retort, that in *their Senſe*, every one knows the *Son* too, *i. e.* (ſay I) they know his Perſonality was eternally begotten by his Father. [I] can't tell *how* and in what Manner the two Natures are united, which conſtitute the Sonſhip; neither can they tell me how their *Son* was eternally begotten. Well then, as

to

to the *How's*, &c. on both Sides, we are on a Level: But here comes the Difference; as they cannot tell *how* Chriſt was eternally begotten, ſo neither can they ſhew that the Nature of Things admits of their Doctrine. Now as to what I aſſert, it is granted even by themſelves, that the Nature of Things do allow that two Natures may be united; and it is plain that this may be called Generation, in as much as an Union of the two Extremes, Divinity and Humanity together, thereby making but one Mediator, is Generation, in a ſtrict Senſe. Obſerve; was it poſſible in the Nature of Things that an eternal independent Perſon could be begotten as to his Perſonality, then as to *how* this could be brought about, we ought all to be ſilent. But as the Nature of God cannot admit of what is a Contradiction *in* and *to* himſelf, it is naturally impoſſible that the Perſonality of an infinite Jehovah ſhould be generated. So that when our *eternal Generationiſts* ſay, that their Oppoſers are for ſearching into the Modus of divine Things, and want to know *how* Things are come to be, as they are, I muſt tell them, that the Charge is utterly falſe; and it is for want of an impartial Judgment between themſelves and us that cauſes it. For *my* Part, I only enquire into the Nature of the Divine Being, as he has revealed himſelf to his Creatures, and I immediately perceive, that if there are three eternal ſelf-exiſtent independent Perſons, the Perſonality of any one of them can never be begotten by another. I own my total Incapacity to diſcover *how*

Three are One, and One Three; and therefore ſimply on divine Revelation make it the Matter of my Faith: But the *Eternal Generationiſts*, by *their* Notions and Scheme, immediately define (or elſe they mean nothing at all) the Modus of the Divine Exiſtence; for one Perſon who was unbegotten himſelf, by an Almighty Act of Generation, *communicated* Perſonality to a ſecond Perſon, and a third Perſon, proceeded perſonally from theſe two, the Begetter and the Begotten; either they don't underſtand a Word of all this, or elſe every body does; for at the firſt View, it gives an Idea that the Father (as an ancient Eternal Generationiſt aſſerted) is the Source of the Deity; but by their own Explanation of the Trinity, they immediately convey the Ideas of the firſt Perſon's being the neceſſary Cauſe of the Second's perſonal Exiſtence. But yet after all this, it ſeems the Trinity in Unity is a profound Myſtery; not as they make it out, I'm very certain; their *Words* may be myſterious perhaps?—Myſterious did I ſay? rather palpable Contradictions; for Independency, and being generated, when applied to the ſame Perſon, as to his Perſonality, are as flat a Contradiction, as I am and I am not at one and the ſame time in one and the ſame Senſe. Wherefore I may juſtly ſay of every eternal Generationiſt, as *Horace* writes concerning *Cyclicus* the Poet, * *Quid dignum tanto feret hic promiſſor Hiatu?* for all of 'em talk largely of the Trinity, the great Myſtery of the Tri-

* Horat. de Arte Poetica, lin. 138.

nity,

nity, the inexplicable Myſtery of three in one, and the glorious Doctrine of three eternal independent, diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead! Theſe Things are ever in their Mouths; and when all comes to all, one Perſon communicates Perſonality in the Divine Eſſence to another, and theſe two in ſome way made up a third, who has the Honour given him of, *perſonally proceeding*. This is *their* Myſtery of three co-equal and independent Perſons in God, which the Generationiſts ſo fondly talk of: *Canſt thou by ſearching find out God?* (ſay they) I anſwer, No. But it looks very much like as if they could, when one Perſon begets another, and a third perſonally proceeds. As to what they ſay concerning our Terms being inſufficient to expreſs their Conceptions by, and that we ſhould not take thoſe they do make uſe of in a *carnal* Senſe; it is all trifling; what their Conceptions are, I really can't ſay; but if they have inexpreſſible ones, it would be very adviſeable that they keep them to their ſelves, or find us a new Language, or rather new Underſtandings. For if they uſe the Modes of Expreſſions uſed by intelligent Beings, they will undoubtedly be ſtript of all *pretended* Senſes, and be brought to their genuine Significations. A proper Eternity hath neither Beginning nor Ending. Generation implies both. Now either they mean, by being *eternal*, and being *begotten* when apply'd to a Perſon in the Godhead one and the ſame thing, or they have diſtinct Meanings by theſe diſtinct Words. If they ſay the firſt, then they are guilty

guilty of an unneceſſary Tautology: If the ſecond, (which they would rather chuſe to ſay, I believe) then they are guilty of joining two diſtinct Words together, which have diſtinct Meanings to expreſs the divine Perſonality of the Son of God, which is as well expreſs'd by one of the Words.

But to return to the Text: *No one knoweth the Son*, &c. *i. e.* no one underſtands the Nature of that Union of two Natures which conſtitutes the Mediator. The great Mr. *Huſſey* (who in other things was a valuable Writer) tells us, as to eternal Generation, that "in re-"ſpect of the Son it was a paſſive Act," *i. e.* the Son was not an immediate Agent as the Father was; ſo that here was an Act, yea, an eternal one, which Dr. *Owen* ſays was *eſſential* to God the Father, in which the Son acted not co-equally with the Father; or in plain intelligible Words in which one Perſon did nothing at all. I am certain this is no *unveiling* of the Redeemer's Glory. But does it not ſound ſtrangely Nonſenſical, to ſay, that in the Act of Generation the Son was *paſſive*, when it is impoſſible, that in the Act of Generation, or ſo long as the Act was acting, any thing ſhould be predicated of that which is the Reſult of this Act of Generation? but perhaps this is ſtill *carnal Reaſon?* I own it; but then it is the *carnal* Conſequence of their *carnal* Poſition. If the *Eternal Generationiſts* will lay aſide their carnal Premiſes, I will freely promiſe to lay aſide, what, perhaps, in a Sneer *they* may call Carnal Concluſions. And really it is downright Shame that ſuch

a *carnal* Term, as an independent Perſon having his Perſonality *communicated*, ſhould ever be uſed by ſerious and ſober Chriſtians.

Inſt. 5. Mark v. 7. *What have I to do with thee, Jeſus, thou Son of the moſt high God.* Theſe Words are brought to prove, that the Legion of bad Spirits viewed *the Son of the moſt high God*, in that Relation, as co-equal and co-eternal with his Father's Perſon. But let us obſerve:

1. That it is not ſaid, *Thou eternal Son*; and doubtleſs had Chriſt been viewed in his Son-ſhip, only as an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon, he would have been called *the moſt high God*, and not the Son of the moſt high God. For,

2. If the firſt and ſecond Perſons in the Trinity be each of them the moſt high God, and the Perſonality of the ſecond was begotten, then the moſt high God begot the moſt high God, which is ridiculous. But it muſt either be granted, or elſe it muſt be own'd, that the Son of God is inferior to God; or to his Begetter. But,

3. It is very plain, that the Son is here viewed as Mediator; What have *I to do with thee, Jeſus, thou Son of the moſt high*, &c. By which it is ſtrongly imply'd, that Jeſus, or the Saviour, as ſuch, was the Son. I adjure thee (ſay the Devils) *by God*, &c. *i. e.* God in all his Perſons ſurely? for what God had a Prerogative of *hindering* the Son, if as Son he was in the Relation of a divine Second Perſon; wherefore it is more plain by the Devils adjuring the Son by God, that God was the Son's ſuperior,

as

as Son, than that by calling Chriſt the Son of the moſt high God, indicated his eternal Sonſhip. In the Relation of Mediator or as the Son, the moſt high God had a Prerogative to lay his Commands on Chriſt, as he himſelf own'd: the *Son can do nothing of himſelf*, but ſtrictly in the Relation of a diſtinct Perſon in God, Chriſt was not to be directed authoritatively by any.

Object. Does not this way of arguing give us confuſed Ideas of the Perſons in God? When you aſſert, that the Mediator is God and Man; that the Son, as ſuch, is the Mediator, and yet ſtill ſay that one Perſon in the Trinity, has not the leaſt Prerogative over another. If the Father has Prerogative over the Mediator, he has ſurely Prerogative over the Second Perſon, for he is in the Capacity of Mediator. To this I anſwer,

1. That inſtead of making a Confuſion in our Ideas, I think I keep all things clear and diſtinct; always conſidering the Perſons in God as bearing each of 'em two different Relations, (1.) As three abſolute, ſovereign, ſelf-exiſtent Perſons; and, (2.) as in the Relations of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In the firſt Relation all the three, eternally were, and eternally will be the ſame Co-equal in poſſeſſive Honour and Glory. But in the ſecond View of theſe glorious co-equal Perſons, *i. e.* in the Oeconomy of Salvation, one is greater in his Office and Character, than the others: The Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Ghoſt proceeds, and all this not in their firſt Relations

diſtinct as God, but in their ſecond, as bearing and acting different and diſtinct Parts in Man's Salvation. Here then is Co-equality and Co-eternity maintained, and yet the Terms *Father* and *Son* have their genuine Signification which Scripture gives to them; for *the Father*, (*i.e.* in that Relation) *is greater than all*; and the *Son can do nothing of himſelf.*

2. As all Duties, which the Redeemer is ſaid to perform, muſt be confined to the Humanity in Union, as more immediately acting and obeying; we may juſtly ſuppoſe that Satan here adjured the *Man* by God, not to caſt him out. For,

3. Tho' Satan ſpeaks to the Son, or the whole Mediator, yet when he adjures by God, we muſt not ſuppoſe that he adjures both God and Man, but that inaſmuch as in the Mediator there is a Nature which *can* be humbled, or, as a Perſon in God has a Nature in Union, inferior to God, by that Means God the Father may be ſaid to have a Prerogative over the Son, that being ſaid of the Whole, which relates diſtinctly to a Part: As it is ſaid of a Man, *he eateth*; *he*, has reference to the whole Man, Soul and Body, but in a ſtrict Senſe, the Body only eateth, or is ſatisfy'd. So Satan ſaid, I adjure *thee*. The perſonal Character refers to the whole Mediator, tho' that, which Satan knew was immediately ſubject to the divine Will and Appointment, was the Man in Union.

Inſt. 6. Prov. viii. 22, 23. *The Lord poſſeſs'd me, in the Beginning of his Ways: Before his Works of old, I was ſet up from Everlaſting*, &c.

This Text is frequently brought, both to prove *Eternal Generation*, and Chriſt's proper Divinity. But as Mr. *Huſſey* obſerves, "I can by no "means think that the Holy Ghoſt meddles "with that Point here.*" For tho' Mr. *Huſſey* held with *Eternal Generation*, yet he plainly ſhews the Weakneſs of bringing this Text to maintain it. I own this Text has reference to begetting the Son; for the Word קָנָנִי here uſed for poſſeſs'd, as *Bythner*, in his *Lyra Prophetica* tells us, may ſignify a poſſeſſing by Generation. But then, I deny that this *in the Beginning*, means from all Eternity, (for the *Hebrew* Word allows not of ſuch a Tranſlation) which is רֵאשִׁית *The* Beginning, without the Prepoſition which is uſed *Gen. i.* And firſt; the Prepoſition ב is there affixed to (*Reſhith*), which renders it *in the Beginning*. But as it is here left out, the Words ought to run thus: "The Lord poſſeſs'd me, *the* Be"ginning of his Ways." Whence it is apparent, that Chriſt by his Generation was the Beginning, or the firſt of all God's Ways; before he did any thing elſe, he begat a Son, *i.e.* took the Man into Union, or otherwiſe created a Soul in Union with the Second Perſon in the Godhead, and by that means the Man Chriſt was the firſt *brought* forth of every Creature. Generation was one of God's ſpecial Ways, and the Beginning of them all. The Chief of all his goings forth of old, was the uniting two Natures, and thereby conſtituting the Son. In

* Glory of Chriſt unveil'd, pag. 82.

this *Beginning* it was that God created the Heavens and the Earth, *Gen.* i. 1. Chriſt was the univerſal Head of all Nature. For (ἐν αὐτῷ) *in him*, ſays the Apoſtle, *All things in Heaven and Earth were created*, Col. i. 16. However, we ſhall ſhew that this Text can neither refer to Chriſt's Divinity, nor to *Eternal Generation*.

1. It can't refer to Chriſt's Godhead, or his divine Perſonality; and that becauſe his Perſonality was Eternal without any Beginning at all; but what was there poſſeſs'd, was ſo poſſeſs'd in the *Beginning* of God's Ways; now God's eternal Ways had no Beginning; wherefore as all the Perſons in God are co-equally eternal, one could not be poſſeſs'd neither in a Beginning of any Ways, nor as the Beginning, for as ſuch he would be one of God's Ways too. Again, he that was poſſeſs'd, was alſo anointed (as the *Hebrew* Word *Naſacti* here tranſlated *ſet up* may ſignify.) But as an infinite Jehovah, Chriſt could never be anointed, nor by that means ſet up as an infinite Perſon in any Senſe.

2. This Text cannot relate to *Eternal Generation*, ſhould the Tranſlation, *in the Beginning*, &c. allow'd to be juſt: For if Chriſt was poſſeſs'd, or begot *in the Beginning* of God's Ways, and not before his Ways, or goings forth began, then as begotten he could not be co-eternal with the Perſon, his Begetter. Whence it is plain, that this Text in the *Proverbs* has relation to the ſetting up the Mediator, and anointing him as having the Humanity in his Perſon,

ſon, *for he was anointed with the Oil of Gladneſs above his Fellows*, i. e. the Mediator was anointed in his Humanity above thoſe who were the Fellows of, or by Creation, on a level with the human Soul. And it is of this Oil of Joy and Gladneſs, that Believers receive, and *Grace* for *Grace*, Joh. i. 16. It is one of the Spiritual Bleſſings, wherewith the Choſen of God were bleſs'd in Chriſt Jeſus before the World began, *Epheſ.* i. 3. This anointing or ſetting up the human Soul of Chriſt in Union, was more than a Decree, for if it was only in Decree, as it is generally ſuppos'd, then in reality Chriſt had no Preheminence as the firſt of the Creation of God, for in God's Decrees there are no firſts and laſts; God decrees not ſucceſſively, for his Knowledge is infinite: Wherefore it muſt be a real actual anointing, of a real actual Soul then exiſting, as the Beginning of God's Ways. And here I am not in the leaſt aſham'd to own that I firmly believe the actual Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt's human Soul, to all other Creatures; the true Knowledge of which, keeps us from falling a Prey to the *Arians*; and gives a beautiful Light into Goſpel Doctrines, and diſcovers how it really is a Truth, that in the whole of Salvation, the Old and New Teſtament Saints, had and have one Faith, *one Lord*, one Baptiſm: Which cannot be true, if the Old Teſtament Saints received Grace from the Second Perſon as an abſolute God, which muſt be (altho' he might be conſidered as united to Humanity, becauſe he certainly would be;) I ſay, the ſame Me-

diator could be not for them, as is for us: For we receive Grace as flowing from the Man in Union, which they never did, if his human Soul did not then actually exiſt. Again; if the Old Teſtament Saints arrived actually to Glory, then the Members were actually glorify'd many Years before the actual Head was, and in this the Head has not the Preheminence. But the maintaining of Pre-exiſtence, gives Chriſt all the Preheminence, and is of uſe particularly in theſe things.*

1. By Pre-exiſtence, the Begetting of Chriſt before the World began, and his Priority to all Creatures, is ſtrictly maintained, whilſt at the ſame time his divine Perſonality in the Godhead, and his Self-exiſtency as ſuch, is not in the leaſt diminiſhed: Whereas thoſe who aſſert that Chriſt's divine Perſonality was begotten and communicated, give the *Arians* juſt Room to triumph; and eſtabliſhes them in their Opinion, that the ſecond Perſon is inferior as ſuch to the firſt. And if the divine eternal Perſonality of the ſecond Perſon cannot be proved on the Hypotheſis of its being communicated, (as it will appear that it cannot) the *Eternal Generationiſts* will have no real Sonſhip for the Lord Jeſus, before the World was created.

2. The actual Pre-exiſtence of the Man in Union, is a Bulwark againſt *Socinianiſm*: For it is a Doctrine that ſo lays the Foundation of *Chriſt* in God, as Son of the *moſt high*, having the Nature of God in ſtrict Union, before the

* See much to this Purpoſe in *Huſſey*'s Glory of Chriſt, pag. 89, 90.

higheſt

higheſt Parts of the Duſt were laid, that none of the *Socinian* Arguments commencing on the Incarnation in the Virgin's Womb can ſhake it, much leſs can the *Socinians* in their Cauſe, that ſtrikes at the Deity of Chriſt, in which the Man perſonally ſubſiſts, be ſtrengthned by it.

3. Pre-exiſtence glorifies Chriſt the Mediator, with an actual Glory before his Incarnation, which according to the oppoſite Scheme, was not actually enjoy'd before 1700 Years ago. Which cauſes People to make ſuch Havock with that Text where Chriſt is praying for a Glory of which he had diveſted himſelf, which was the ſame that he had with the Father before the World was: But by this Scheme he is proved to have had, as Mediator, an actual Glory which he actually laid aſide, when he locally, by Virtue of the Humanity in Union deſcended on Earth, died on the Croſs, roſe again and aſcended *up where* he himſelf ſays, *he was before.* Not as in *Decree*; for from thence, in that Senſe, he could never deſcend; nor where he was before as God; for as ſuch he could neither aſcend nor deſcend.

4. The actual Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt's human Soul, ſtrictly and beautifully maintains the actual Covenant between Father and Son. The divine ſecond Perſon having the human Soul in Union, by that could engage with the Father, to pay a Ranſom for the Elect, to obey the Law in their ſteads, and to preſent them faultleſs before the Throne of the Majeſty on high. Whereas the contrary Scheme

Scheme ſtrangely ſuppoſes the divine ſecond Perſon as ſuch, counſelling and covenanting with the firſt Perſon, and promiſing to do this and the other, and mediating with the Father for his People, when all the while he actually wanted an eſſential Part of the Mediator, *viz.* the Humanity, which being wanted, he could not, as it is expreſſed in *Job*, lay his Hand on both Parties, and therefore could not officiate as Mediator. Beſides, the above way of treating the Covenant, makes one Perſon to ſignify and relate Things which he would have done, to another, which is prepoſterous. But Preexiſtence ſets all theſe Things to rights, and diſcovers the Nature of the glorious Mediation made by the Son to the Father. In ſhort,

4. And laſtly, It gives Chriſt an actual Preheminence in all Things, either relating to his Glory as God, or his Honour in his mediatorial Character, making him, as Mr. *Huſſey* expreſſes it, "An *elder Man* than *Adam*, and "ſo more fit to be called God's Fellow." Theſe are the Benefits ariſing from the Preexiſtent Scheme; and for my part I think very great ones they are: However, the Proofs for the Scheme being founded on the whole Tenour of Scripture, I leave ſtill * with thoſe better ſkill'd in that Controverſy than myſelf. But this I muſt ſay, that the Beauty of the Goſpel-Scheme of Salvation is very much loſt without it. We proceed to another Text brought for *Eternal Generation*.

* Glory of Chriſt unveil'd; pag. 191. See the laſt Pamphlet, pag. 43.

Inſt.

Inſt. 7. Prov. xxx. 4. *What is his Name, and what is his Son's Name, if thou can'ſt tell?* This Text I have heard inſiſted upon with as much Eagerneſs, as if it had laid down the Doctrine in expreſs Terms. But it no more proves *Eternal Generation*, or the *Communication of Perſonality*, than that Text which ſays, *Abraham begat Iſaac, and Iſaac begat Jacob*; for the Text affirms nothing, except it be that *he who eſtabliſhed the Ends of the Earth*, had a Son. But if People would but conſider the Nature of the Argument, that they *would have* to flow from this Text, I'm certain they would not be ſo ſtrenuous in quoting it; for how vaſtly bright, is ſuch an Argument as this; I do not know my Friend's Name; therefore it muſt be *Nebuchadnezzar*. The Concluſion that there muſt have been an eternal Son, from this Text, is not one whit better. Moſt Expoſitors own that, *What is his Son's Name?* implies that it could not be told; for Mr. *Huſſey* ſays, it was left for Chriſt himſelf to reveal, (tho' by the way) Chriſt never did reveal that he was the *eternal Son* of the *eternal Father*, or that his Perſonality was *communicated*. However; it is agreed the Old Teſtament Saints knew not the Name of the Son of God; from whence the *Eternal Generationiſts* draw the Concluſion; therefore he was the *eternal Son*. This is moſt profound Reaſoning! that the Old Teſtament Saints Ignorance of the Son's Name ſhould prove it, the *eternal Son*. But as I am apprehenſive this Text is only brought when none elſe is in Memory, that

ſomething may be ſaid, we ſhall paſs it, and proceed to another.

Inſt. 8. Rom. viii. 3. *God ſent his own Son in the Likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh.* Hence (they aſſert) that it is evident that the Sonſhip of Chriſt was previous to his Union with the Humanity. I grant, that Sonſhip was antecedent to the Incarnation; but I deny that the Humanity was not united before the Incarnation, to which the Text refers. For if there was not an actual Mediator in a ſtrict and proper Senſe before the Incarnation, then (as I ſaid before) the Old Teſtament Saints poſſeſs'd the Glory which their Head had not actually poſſeſs'd before them. But if we compare this Text with *Hebrews* x. 5. we ſhall ſee that the Likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh was no more than the Body; for that properly is the Likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh. It is ſaid, *Sacrifice and Burnt-Offerings thou woud'ſt not, but a Body haſt thou prepared me*, i. e. for an Offering; thus had this referr'd immediately to the Second Perſon in the Godhead, in that Relation, it would not be expreſſive of the Union of the two Natures, becauſe both Body and Soul was prepared for the Second Perſon; wherefore it is plain that this Body was prepared for the human Soul which deſcended to accept of it, and by that means the whole Man perform'd Obedience to the Law; as he promis'd, ſaying, *Lo, I come, in the Volume of the Book it is written of me, I delight to do thy Will, O my God; yea, thy Law is within my Heart.* This was the Language of the Son who was ſent;

and

and if ſuch Language as, *O my God*, can be thought to proceed from the eternal Second Perſon in that Relation only, then it may alſo juſtly be thought that ſimply as a divine Perſon, he was the Son. But it can only refer to the Man in Union, to which Mr. *Huſſey* agrees.*

Inſt. 9. Rev. ii. 18. *Theſe Things, ſaith the Son of God, who hath his Eyes like unto a Flame of Fire; and his Feet are like fine Braſs.* Whence it is imagin'd that the Son here muſt have ſpecial Relation to the Second Perſon in that Capacity conſider'd. But this cannot be: For,

1. The ſame Things, which are ſaid here of the Son of God, is alſo apply'd to the Son of Man, in Chap. i. of this Revelation, and Ver. 13, 14, and 15.—*And I ſaw one like unto the Son of Man——his Eyes were as a Flame of Fire——and his Feet like unto fine Braſs.* Whence it is apparent, that the ſame things being apply'd to the Son of Man, as is apply'd to the Son of God, that the Son of God is ſo, by Virtue of the Humanity in Union with the Deity.

2. That the *Son* of God here mention'd, is ſo by Mediatorſhip, further appears, from this Son in his talking with *John*, uſing the Words of the Pſalmiſt in *Pſal.* ii. 9. In the 27th Ver. of this 2d Chap. of *Revelations*, he ſays, ſpeaking of thoſe who endure to the End,—*And he ſhall rule them with a Rod of Iron: As the Veſſel of a Potter ſhall they be broken to Shi-*

* Glory of Chriſt unveil'd, pag. 214, 215.

vers,

vers, even as I receiv'd of my Father. Hence we find, that the Son of God as ſuch, receiv'd Power from his Father, and therefore as Son, cannot be co-equal and co-eternal with God.

Inſt. 10. Micha v. 2. *Whoſe Goings forth have been from of old from everlaſting.* This is alſo produced for *Eternal Generation.* I cannot give a better Reaſon than Mr. *Huſſey* does, to prove that this Text cannot relate to *Eternal Generation.* For (ſays he) "The "Phraſe being an *active*, not a paſſive Phraſe "of the Son of God; or rather, a Phraſe of "what the *Son's Acts* were, than of what the "*Father's Act* was (and the eternal Genera-"tion of the Son muſt be the *Father's* Act "only) it doth not ſeem at all to ſignify the "*Eternal Generation* of the Son of God, "which Eternal Generation in reſpect of the "Son, muſt be to our Conceptions, if we "ſpeak grammatically to underſtand one an-"other, a *paſſive* Thing, or a Thing which "the Father did towards the Son, not which "the Son did towards himſelf *". This is, in my Opinion, a ſolid Argument againſt the forc'd Expoſition, the Eternal Generationiſts would have put on this Text: For moſt aſſuredly the Son's own Goings forth muſt ſignify *his* Acts, and not the Father's; for it is agreeable to their own Sentiments, that Eternal Generation was the Father's Act diſtinctly; and therefore the Son's Actings or Goings forth of old, from everlaſting, will never expreſs the Father's Acts.

* Glory of Chriſt unveil'd, pag. 58.

Inſt.

Inſt. 11. Dan. iii. 25. — *Lo, I ſee four Men looſe, walking in the midſt of the Fire,* and *they have no Hurt, and the Form of the fourth is like the Son of God.* It is probable, (ſays a noted Author) that *Nebuchadnezzar* had heard from the *Jews*, who were in his Dominions, that there was a divine Perſon who was called the Son of God, and ſeeing ſuch an one in the Furnace, he concludes he muſt be like him.

That *Nebuchadnezzar* might of heard of a divine Perſon being *called* the Son of God, I do not deny; but it is very improbable, that he had heard that this Son was merely a divine Perſon, in that Relation only: If he had, he talk'd very ſtrangely to call the fourth Perſon *a Man, Lo, I ſee four Men,* &c. — and *the fourth,* i. e. the *fourth Man,* is like unto the Son of God. Beſides, had the *Jews* informed *Nebuchadnezzar* concerning the Son of God, they could never have informed him of his Likeneſs, if as Son he was an infinite ſelf-exiſtent Perſon, for as ſuch he is inviſible; and therefore if as *Son* he be merely ſuch a Perſon, as *Son*, *Nebuchadnezzar* ſaw him not. But it is very clear, that the *Jews* (if they had ſignify'd to *Nebuchadnezzar* any thing of a Son) that they had inform'd him, that this Son was God and Man; or elſe he would never have judg'd from the glorious Appearance of the fourth Man, that he was the Son of God. But what trifling Arguments do the Eternal Generationiſts bring? they catch at every Text, which ſpeaks of *Son*, tho' never ſo foreign to their Purpoſe, to prove their fond Hypotheſis.

They'll

They'll aſſert, that a divine eternal Perſon, as ſuch, may be ſeen, (as the Argument from the above Text ſhews us) rather than loſe one Scripture that mentions *Son of God.*

Thus I have diſpatch'd the firſt Thing I promis'd to do; and if a more genuine Interpretation, which hath more Relation to the Contexts, can be given to thoſe Scriptures, I have inſtanced, I hope on the firſt Sight I have of ſuch Interpretations, I ſhall be ready willingly to renounce my own.

CHAP. II.

Dreadful Conſequences, ſhewn to attend the Doctrine of the Eternal Generation of one Perſon in God, or Perſonality being begot, or communicated.

I SHALL but be brief on this Point, having all along this, and the former Pamphlet, ſpoken ſomething of the very ſad Conſequences which naturally attend the Aſſertion, that the Perſonality of one Perſon in God, was begotten or communicated; not that I think that thoſe who maintain *Eternal Generation*, are appriz'd of the Conſequences their Opinion has; becauſe I truſt they deſire by all their Doctrines to glorify Chriſt in his Perſon and Offices. But it is their Unwillingneſs to enquire into the Nature of their Aſſertions, and at the ſame time their Backwardneſs to embrace any thing, which has not the concurrent Sanction of the *Fathers*, that hinders them from coming into a conſiſtent

conſiſtent Knowledge of the God with whom they have to do. To ſpeak then particularly:

Conſ. 1. If the eternal Second Perſon in the Godhead was eternally begotten as to his divine Perſonality, by the firſt; it neceſſarily follows, that he was eternally dependent on his Begetter, for his Perſonality, or perſonal Subſiſtence. Dr. *Owen*, as I have before obſerv'd; tells us that, "All the Properties of the Divine Na-" ture, together with Perſonalty, are commu-" nicated by the Father to the Son." Whence it is apparent, that he whoſe Perſonality was communicated, was not co-equally independent with him whoſe Perſonality was not communicated.

Conſ. 2. He whoſe Perſon was *begotten*, or *communicated*, cannot be ſelf-exiſtent. His perſonal Exiſtence muſt not exiſt of itſelf, but from the Will and Act of his Begetter. To this it is ſaid, that it was an eternal neceſſary Act in the firſt Perſon to beget a Son, and the eternal neceſſary Property of another Perſon to be begotten. If ſo,

(1.) It was the eternal neceſſary Property, of one Perſon in God to be paſſive, or not to have any Part in one eternal Act which the firſt Perſon perform'd, and which Act Dr. *Owen* * tells us was eſſential to the Divine Eſſence; ſo that there was one eternal Act eſſential to the Divine Eſſence, in which one Perſon in the Godhead did not act. What ſtrange Aſſertions do great and good Men bring forth, when they talk on this Point!

* See his Treatiſe on the Perſon of Chriſt, pag. 14.

(2.) If *Eternal Generation* be a neceſſary Act in God, it is ſtill performing; for all things neceſſary or eſſential to God, muſt from Eternity, without Beginning, to Eternity without Ending, be the ſame.

Conſ. 3. The Perſonality of one Perſon in the Godhead being begotten, or produc'd, muſt neceſſarily deſtroy God's Immutability. This muſt be granted, or elſe the Second Perſon, or the Son, as he is call'd, is not yet begotten: For either this eternal Act of Generation or Communication of Perſonality, muſt have a Period put to it, or elſe the Perſonality of the Son always was, is, and ever will be begetting or communicating, and ſo never *begot* or communicated. If the firſt is aſſerted, then it will follow, that the Divine Exiſtence is chang'd; for whilſt the Act was *performing*, it was not *performed*, and therefore whilſt the firſt Perſon was generating, the ſecond to be generated exiſted not; but when the Perſon was begotten, or a Period was put to the Act of Generation, then there exiſted a Perſon which did not actually exiſt whilſt Generation was acting. But if it is ſtill aſſerted that the Act of Generation, or of communicating Perſonality is not ended, nor ever will be, (which muſt be the Caſe if it be an eſſential Act) it follows therefore, that as Perſonality is ever generating or communicating, or if the firſt Perſon be ever begetting, and communicating Perſonality, that this Perſonality is not communicated; and of neceſſity there is no Son yet, according to this Scheme. Theſe Things (without any further Enlargement) by

a Perſon's ſerious and mature Conſideration on what he aſſerts, will be evidently manifeſted to follow the Doctrine of Eternal Generation or Communication of Perſonality in God. Wherefore, if the *Eternal Generationiſts* would free themſelves from theſe Incumbrances, the moſt adviſeable Way will be honeſtly, like Friends to apparent Truth, to give up their Doctrine; for I believe the more they go about to explain their Doctrine and Sentiments, the more they will be incumbred with Difficulties like thoſe before-mention'd. Tho' the Generality of them are indeed wiſe enough to explain their Terms away, and ſo leave no Meaning at all to what they ſay, *ex. gr.* The *Production* of the Son, was a Term, as Dr. *Ridgley* obſerves, which the Eternal Generationiſts were wont to uſe. But ſays the Doctor, " this Idea (*i. e.* of *Pro-*
" *duction*) they happily explain away, and ſay it
" is not ſuch a Production as where the Cauſe
" produces the Effect. This Expreſſion then had
" better be laid aſide, leſt it ſhould be thought
" we conclude the Son not equally neceſſary,
" and co-exiſtent with the Father." And indeed, I ſhould be exceeding glad to ſee the Co-eternity and Co-equality, of that Perſon who was begot, or had his Perſonality communicated, defended; with him who did beget and communicate, I mean on that Hypotheſis; [I] think it impoſſible: But what cannot the learned do? Surely the ſame ingenious Perſons who maintain the Terms, *Eternal Generation*, and *eſſential Filiation*, and *eternal Communication of Perſonality*, &c. can find Mean-

ing to them, and convey ſuch noble Ideas by explaining the Doctrine as ſhall carry Evidence almoſt with the Sound. But really, I very much doubt in my own Mind, that any of our Moderns *can* do it; and that for a very good Reaſon. You muſt know, the ancient Writers and *Fathers* left their Terms, without explaining their Meaning. Thus *Philo* a *Jew* tells us that Chriſt is " the Father's moſt ancient " Son, his firſt-born; who being begotten by " him, imitated his Father's ways; and ſeeing " his Exemplars did the ſame Things." I am apprehenſive he never went about, upon this Aſſertion, to defend the *ancient* Son's Co-equality, as an Imitator, with the Perſon he imitated; he left this for future Ages. But before we go any farther, it may be proper to ſhew how the *Scripture* immediately applies the Terms *Begotten* and *Son* to Chriſt; which are all center'd in him as God-man and Mediator.

Firſt then; Chriſt was the Son or begotten of God, by Virtue of an eternal Decree, *Pſalm* ii. 7. *I will declare the Decree, the Lord hath ſaid unto me, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.* Hence it is manifeſt, that there was a Decree which preceded Chriſt's Sonſhip, which could not be if as Son he was the divine eternal Second Perſon in God ſimply conſider'd. For how ſtrange is it to ſay, that the decreed, did decree with the Decreer; which muſt be aſſerted, if as Second Perſon Chriſt is ſaid to be the Son.

2. By the Reſurrection from the dead, Chriſt was immediately begotten, *Acts* xiii. 33. *God hath*

hath fulfilled the ſame unto us, in that he hath raiſed Jeſus from the dead; as it is alſo written in the ſecond Pſalm, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.*

3. As the Secret Man in God, Chriſt was begot; *Prov.* viii. 22. *The Lord poſſeſs'd me, the Beginning of his Ways*; which ſignifies, according to the *Hebrew*, the Lord *begot me*, &c. or as the *Septuagint* renders it, the Lord *created me*, &c. uſing the Verb κτιζω, which may come from κταομαι, to poſſeſs. So that the poſſeſſing of Chriſt as the Secret Man in Union, was both by *Generation*, thereby begetting a Son, and by *Creation*, the human Soul being created in this Union.

4. The Scriptures inform us, that Chriſt was begot immediately to his diſtinct Offices.

(1.) As Prophet, *Heb.* i. 2. — *hath in theſe laſt Days ſpoken unto us by his Son*; the Son is the great Prophet, who hath ſpoken under the Goſpel Diſpenſation, which muſt be as he was God immediately, or as he was Man, or as God and Man. Not as God, for in that Capacity he is own'd to be incapable of revealing God's Perfections, or rather Man is incapacitated to hear from him as diſtinctly God. Neither only as Man could Chriſt reveal the Father, for as ſuch diſtinctly conſidered, he was not acquainted with the Depth of the great myſterious Ways and Deſigns of God; and if we ſuppoſe him only as Man to reveal God, we ſhall have a Conception of him as out of Union; wherefore it is very plain, that as God and Man, Chriſt was the Prophet, or the Son of God,

hath ſpoken by his Son. The Man, in Union with the Divinity, was that Medium by which God revealed himſelf to Man; and together with the divine Second Perſon was the Son by whom God ſpake.

(2.) To the Office of Prieſthood, Chriſt was Begotten, *Heb.* v. 5. — *Chriſt glorify'd not himſelf to be made an High-Prieſt, but he that ſaid unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee.* The evident Expoſition of which is, "That Chriſt took not to himſelf "the prieſtly Office, and thereby glorify'd "himſelf; but *he* glorify'd him, and put the "prieſtly Glory on him, that ſaid, Thou art "my Son, to-day have I begotten thee."

(3.) Chriſt was immediately begotten to the kingly Office, *Pſalm* ii. 6. *Yet have I ſet my King, on my holy Hill of Zion.* Compare this Text with *Heb.* i. 18. and it will appear, that the Son was this King ſet up, or anointed: *But unto the Son he ſaith, thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteouſneſs is the Scepter of thy Kingdom.* As a divine Almighty Sovereign, the Second Perſon in the Godhead, could not be ſet up or anointed as King; the *Son* was ſet up as King, therefore the Son as ſuch was not merely the divine Second Perſon, but the Mediator begotten to his kingly Office.

I believe this may be as convenient a Place as any, to do what I have promiſed in the Title Page concerning ſome Arguments Mr. *Gill* in his Treatiſe on the *Trinity*, has uſed on the Doctrine of *Eternal Generation.*

It

It may be, ſome will call me an *impudent, conceited* Fellow, thus to ſpeak any thing againſt what ſo learned and judicious a Man has wrote. But ſuch Babble moves me not in the leaſt; and *Philalethes* in this, (like *Gallio* in another Caſe) *careth for none of theſe Things.* I truſt it is a true Zeal for the Glory of the divine Second Perſon, that invites me thus to write, and in writing to accept no Man's Perſon, nor give flattering Titles to Man. Mr. *Gill* has certainly deſerv'd well of all Lovers of the Truth as it is in Jeſus, both as an Author and as a Miniſter; and as ſuch I deſire to treat him, and what he has written; tho' in my Opinion, he does not keep the Argument free from the *Arians*, when he ſpeaks of *Eternal Generation* and Perſonality begetting Perſonality, *&c.* But let that be as it will, the *Arians* have little Cauſe to triumph; for tho' the Deity of Chriſt can never be proved by *Eternal Generation*; yet Mr. *Gill*, with many other judicious Orthodox Writers, has produced in his Treatiſe ſuch Arguments as no *Arian* can ſurmount, or with any ſeeming Force of Reaſon reply to.

There are two Things, which I ſhall particularly take Notice of in this judicious Author's Treatiſe.

1. Of the Objections, which in Page 165, he ſaith he has againſt that Aſſertion, that Chriſt being in Office as Mediator, is the Cauſe of his being called the Son of God.

2. I ſhall make a few Remarks on the Proofs which Mr. *Gill* brings, that Chriſt is Son, "As

" a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead." And,

1. As to the Objections.

Object. 1. Pag. 166. " If Chriſt (ſays Mr. " *Gill*) is the Son of God by Office, and not " Nature, then he muſt be ſo only in an im- " proper, alluſive, and metaphorical Senſe; " juſt as Magiſtrates are called Gods, and the " Children of the moſt High. Whereas, he is " called his own Son, his only-begotten Son, " and the Son of himſelf."

I freely grant, for my Part, that Chriſt is a Son by Nature; but then it is not by one Nature, but by two, human and divine united; for Chriſt's divine Nature only, proves *his* Son-ſhip, no more, than the Holy Ghoſt being of the ſame Eſſence with God, will prove his *Son-ſhip* too. Well, " If not by Nature, (*i. e.* I ſuppoſe his divine Nature) ſays Mr. *Gill*, " then Chriſt is Son only in an alluſive Senſe, " *&c.*" This I deny; for tho' Chriſt may not be God's Son by his divine Nature only, yet it is certainly poſſible he may be ſo by the real Union of two Natures in one Perſon; which will keep him from being a Son in ſuch an alluſive Senſe as Magiſtrates are Sons. And Chriſt may be God's *own* Son, *proper Son*, &c. and yet not ſo by his divine Nature, in as much as there was never a greater Miracle performed than the Union of two diſtinct different Natures in one Perſon. But if Mr. *Gill* intimates here, that Chriſt is a Son by his divine Nature, how will this agree with what he ſays, Pag. 183, 184. when he aſſerts, that " Eſſence does not

" beget

" beget Eſſence, but Perſon begets Perſon"? If ſo, by his own Argument Chriſt is not a Son or the Begotten, by his divine Nature or Eſſence, and if not by that, I am certain not by his human Nature; wherefore, according to Mr. *Gill*'s own way of treating the Subject, Chriſt muſt be Son by Virtue of the divine and human Nature united, or elſe Mr. *Gill* contradicts himſelf. For firſt, he ſays Chriſt is a Son of God, from his divine Nature, and then he aſſerts, that Eſſence or Nature, does not beget Eſſence. If ſo, it is impoſſible that Chriſt ſhould be Son of God from his divine Nature, becauſe the Son is begotten, but the Eſſence is not.

Object. 2. " The Mediatorſhip (ſays the " great Man) is not the Foundation of Son- " ſhip, but the Sonſhip is the Foundation of " Mediatorſhip. He is not the Son of God, " becauſe he is Mediator; but he is Me- " diator becauſe he is the Son of God."

Anſw. What Affinity there is between the Son of God, if as ſuch he is only an eternal, ſelf-exiſtent Perſon in the Godhead, and the Mediator, that his being a begotten, ſelf-exiſtent Perſon ſhould be the Cauſe of his being the Mediator, Mr. *Gill* has not ſhewn us; except it is thought that as Second Perſon, or as the begotten of God, and ſo lying in the Boſom of the Father, and by that means being privy to all his Thoughts, capacitated the Second Perſon as ſuch for the Mediator, as Mr. *Gill* ſays it did for the prieſtly Office, pag. 167. But ſuch a way of proving Chriſt's eternal Sonſhip

being the Cauſe of his Mediatorſhip, in my Opinion, is mere trifling; for why ſhould the Second Perſon's being privy to the Father's Counſels any more capacitate *him*, for Mediatorſhip, than the *third* Perſon's Knowledge of the Counſels and Thoughts of the Father, qualify'd *him* for this Work; nay, the Father might as well be ſuppos'd to be privy to the *Son*'s Counſels; for according to their own Conceſſion the Perſons were all on a level; and ſo he being a *Father*, might as well qualify him for a Mediator, as being a Son did our Saviour, if as Son he was ſimply conſidered a Perſon in the Godhead. However, Mr. *Gill* proceeds; and endeavours to prove that Chriſt was Son, previous to his being Mediator. He endeavours this, by conſidering the three diſtinct Offices Chriſt is employ'd in, *King*, *Prieſt*, and *Prophet*. And Mr. *Gill* dwells all along upon this; that the *Son* is ſaid to be inveſted with theſe Offices, and therefore muſt be Son previous to the Inveſture. To this I agree. But then;

It is impoſſible, that the Son ſhould be inveſted with any one of theſe Offices, if as Son he is diſtinctly and barely a divine Second Perſon in God; for as ſuch he was not in a Capacity of *executing* any of them.

(1.) Not of the kingly Office in *Zion*, becauſe this Kingdom was one that was *given to him*, and therefore in that Senſe did not belong to him as an abſolute God: And as to executing his Office in this Kingdom, as it was not merely his by Virtue of his divine Nature, he muſt

muſt want a Nature to exerciſe his Office by; or rather his Subjects could not bear his Government, without he had ſome other Nature in Union with *his* own to rule them by. Neither, I believe, will Mr. *Gill* ſay, that Chriſt does enjoy a kingly Office which was given him over *Zion*, merely as a divine Second Perſon in God without Relation to his Mediatorſhip; and if ſo, in the Relation of Mediator, he was inaugurated into his kingly Office.

(2.) As an abſolute eternal Perſon in God, Chriſt could not be a Prieſt, Mr. *Gill* quotes *Heb.* vii. 28. —— *But the Word of the Oath maketh the Son, who is conſecrated for evermore*, to prove Chriſt was Son previous to his prieſtly Office. I believe he was; for the Mediator muſt be ſuch, *i. e.* muſt have two Natures united previous to his immediate Inauguration, into his diſtinct Offices; and the Scripture lays it down that to each of his Offices, the Mediator was immediately begotten; tho' all center in him as the Mediator begotten. But before the Second Perſon had the Humanity united to him, it was impoſſible he ſhould execute the Office of Atonement peculiar to the Prieſthood, being not a compleat Mediator. Neither,

(3.) Could Chriſt, abſtractedly conſidered as a divine Second Perſon, execute the Office of Prophet. This we have ſhewn before. (But if Mr. *Gill* owns that the Second Perſon did not barely as ſuch, perform mediatorial Offices without the human Nature in Union). However Chriſt may be called *Son* previous to his imme-

immediate Inveſtiture with his Offices, he could not as Son be barely the Second Perſon in God, becauſe as Son he is inveſted with his Offices, which would be all to no Purpoſe, if as Son he could not perform them. And it is plain, that by our Scheme the Son or Mediator muſt exiſt as ſuch, before any Offices could be given him to perform, the two Natures muſt previouſly have been united before the Inveſtiture of any Office.

Object. 3. Another Objection Mr. *Gill* brings againſt Chriſt's Sonſhip, as Mediator, is, that "ſome Scriptures (*he* ſays) do mani-"feſtly diſtinguiſh Chriſt as a Son, from the "Conſideration of him in the mediatorial Of-"fice, Pag. 168." I can't tell where theſe Texts lie, that do thus; I am certain not in Mr. *Gill's* Book. However, the firſt he quotes for this Purpoſe, is *Acts* viii. 37. *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* A very fair Confeſſion, that the Mediator, who has two Natures in one Perſon, is the *Son* of God: But, ſays Mr. *Gill*, "If this Phraſe Son of God is only "expreſſive of his Office as Mediator, it coin-"cides with the other Phraſe *Jeſus Chriſt*; "and then the Senſe is, I believe that Chriſt "is the Chriſt, or the Mediator is the Media-"tor." To this I reply;

1. That ſuppoſing there was a Coincident in the Eunuch's Confeſſion, the Warmth of his Zeal might eaſily excuſe it. But,

2. It is not a Coincident in the leaſt, for the Eunuch only confeſs'd, that he really believ'd that the Perſon whom *Philip* (doubtleſs) in his Sermon had called Jeſus Chriſt, was the Son of God,

God, the true expected Meſſiah. For tho' Jeſus Chriſt and the Son are Terms ſynonimous, yet as the Eunuch ſpoke them, their Senſes differ; as the Repetition of the ſame Word in what Rhetoricians call a *Ploce*, differs from the firſt naming it. Thus the firſt naming of Jeſus Chriſt in the Eunuch's Confeſſion related immediately to the common Name by which the Meſſiah was known, by ſaying that he was the Son of God, was a Confeſſion which carried a full Perſuaſion and Acknowledgment that the very Perſon who had lately appeared in the World, was *the* true Meſſiah, in Oppoſition to all pretended ones. So that to ſay Jeſus Chriſt is Jeſus Chriſt, is not ſo ridiculous as Mr. *Gill* would inſinuate, ſince the firſt relates to the common Name of our Saviour, and the Repetition is expreſſive of the Certainty of his being the very, the only Saviour which was to come. In this Mode of Speech *Jacob* is ſaid rightly to be called *Jacob*. Now as Mr. *Gill* doubtleſs underſtands Rhetoric, and that a Repetition of the ſame proper Name may be made without a Coincident. As in *Virgil*, *Corydon eſt Corydon*. *Corydon* was *Corydon*, i. e. he was what he was noted to be, a ſweet Singer. I ſay, as Mr. *Gill* is certainly acquainted with the various Modes of Speech, it ſeems vaſtly beneath him to talk of a Coincident, in ſaying Jeſus Chriſt is the Son; or, as he ſays, Chriſt is the Chriſt, altho' Son, and Jeſus Chriſt denote the very ſame. But,

3. According to Mr. *Gill*'s Notion of the Son of God, Jeſus Chriſt, or the Mediator, could

could not be *him*; for Jeſus Chriſt has two Natures, but according to Mr. *Gill*, the Son as ſuch, has only one individual divine Nature. And if the Eunuch, as Mr. *Gill* obſerves, confeſs'd that Jeſus Chriſt, the true Meſſiah, the Saviour of Sinners, *&c.* was the Son of God, in Mr. *Gill's* Senſe of the Phraſe Son of God; he muſt own, what was not: For he muſt confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt the Mediator, who has two Natures in one Perſon, was the Son of God, who has only one Nature in his Perſon, as Son. This, I think, is rather worſe than a Coincident, for it is a Contradiction: Firſt it aſſerts two Natures in the Perſon, and then but one.

4. Mr. *Gill* ſays that the Eunuch confeſs'd, that the Meſſiah, who was ſent into the World, was no leſs a Perſon than the Son of God. From whence it may juſtly be argu'd,

1. That the Mediator has two Natures in one Perſon; the Son is the Mediator, therefore the Son has two Natures in one Perſon.

2. He that was ſent into the World, was the Mediator; the *Son* was ſent into the World; therefore the Son was the Mediator. And,

3. The Mediator was not co-equal with God. The Son was the Mediator; therefore the Son was not co-equal with God, *i. e.* as Son: For as Son he is own'd by Mr. *Gill* to be qualify'd for the mediatorial Office, Page 167. Again; Mr. *Gill* quotes under his third Objection, *Acts* ix. 20. *Paul preach'd Chriſt in the Synagogues, that he was the Son of God*, i. e. ſays Mr. *Gill*, " He preach'd that the Meſſiah, who had

" lately

" lately appeared in the World, with all the " true Characters of the promis'd one, was a " divine Perſon, no leſs than the Son of God." This I can agree with as the Words lay; but according to Mr. *Gill*'s Acceptation of the Phraſe *Son of God*, I can't think *Paul* preach'd Chriſt to be *the Son*; for tho' the eternal divine Second Perſon might, by Virtue of Union with the Humanity, become the Son of God, yet as thus united, the Mediator could not be merely the divine Second Perſon, becauſe as Mediator he has two Natures, and conſidered as a diſtinct Perſon in God, he has but one: So that if *Paul* preached Chriſt, or the Mediator to be the divine Second Perſon only, he aſſerted, that he that had two Natures, was the very ſame in the ſame Senſe that had but one Nature: And it is very certain that the Second Perſon in the Trinity was not, in this Relation, the Meſſiah, nor the Meſſiah in that Relation, the eternal Second Perſon in the Godhead ſimply conſider'd; and therefore it can never be ſaid that the Mediator is the Son of God, in Mr. *Gill*'s Senſe of the Term.

But to proceed:

" In fine, (*ſays Mr.* Gill) If Chriſt is the " Son, only as Mediator, then he is ſo as a Ser- " vant; for Chriſt as Mediator, is God's righ- " teous Servant; and ſo thoſe Ideas of Son and " Servant, which are otherwiſe clear and diſtinct, " are blended together and confounded; and " that beautiful Antitheſis between *Moſes* and " Chriſt is ſpoil'd, where *Moſes* is ſaid to be " faithful in all his Houſe as a Servant, but " Chriſt as a Son over his own Houſe."

To this I reply;

That the Idea of Son and Servant, are not blended at all by aſſerting Chriſt to be Son only as Mediator, tho' the Mediator be a Servant. For,

(1.) The Property of a Son is to be begotten, which is not the Property of a Servant in that Capacity. And,

(2.) The Duties of a Son and Servant are entirely diſtinct; the one obeys, as by Nature he is ſubject to his Father; the other as under the lordly Commands of his Maſter, which may be but temporary. So that tho' Chriſt ſerves as Mediator, and Servant, yet his Sonſhip is not at all thereby deſtroy'd. Beſides,

(3.) It is incumbent on every Son that he be dutiful and obey his Father, which Chriſt in the Capacity merely of an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon could not do, no more than the firſt Perſon could obey him. Again; Mr. *Gill* tells us, "A Son and a Servant are always diſtinct; "not but that he who is a Son may alſo be a "Servant; but then he is not a Son becauſe "he is ſo." I own with Mr. *Gill*, that Chriſt's Sonſhip depends not on his being a Servant; but I aſſert his doing the Office of a Servant depended on his Sonſhip, *i. e.* on the Union of the two Natures; for as God he could not obey the Father's Commands, but as Son it was his Duty ſo to do. And as to our Lord's Words, *John* viii. 35. *The Servant abideth not in the Houſe for ever, but the Son abideth ever.* It is plain that he there only intimates, that tho' he performed the Office of a Servant,

Servant, yet he was more than barely a Servant, becauſe he abided in the Houſe for ever, *i. e.* as Son; but in the Capacity of a Servant he did not abide for ever. And with regard to the Antitheſis Mr. *Gill* ſpeaks of between *Moſes* and Chriſt, it lies between the Houſes; *Moſes* was faithful as a Servant over the Houſe of God, which in Propriety was not his own; but Chriſt was faithful as a Son over his *own Houſe*, over the Houſe of his Elect which the Father had given him.

Object. 4. "Some Scriptures ſpeak of Chriſt as "the Son of God, as adding a Luſtre to his Of-"fice, and as putting a Virtue into his Actions "as Mediator; yea, as tho' it was ſomething "ſurprizing, that he, being the Son of God, "ſhould act the Part of Mediator." The Text which Mr. *Gill* ſays ſhews that Chriſt's Sonſhip added Luſtre to his mediatorial Office is *Heb.* iv. 14. *Seeing then that we have ſuch a great High Prieſt, that is paſs'd into the Heavens, Jeſus the Son of God, let us hold faſt our Profeſſion.* Except the eternal Second Perſon (as the Son as ſuch is call'd) in *that Relation*, can be prov'd to be Jeſus, the ſent Saviour, the Words *Jeſus the Son of God*, will add no Beauty at all to the prieſtly Office. *Jeſus* is a Term which belongs ſolely to the Mediator, and therefore would never be join'd immediately with the *Son*, if the *Son* as ſuch was merely an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon. Beſides, how is it poſſible that that which is a Part of a Thing ſhould add a Luſtre to that which cannot be without it? As thus, ſuppoſing

the Son as ſuch was eternal and ſelf-exiſtent; how could he give a Luſtre to the Mediator, or the mediatorial Actions, whilſt he himſelf is the main conſtituent Part in the Mediator? he would then add a Luſtre to himſelf. The Deity or divine Perſonality adds a Luſtre to what the Man in Union does, but the Deity cannot add a Luſtre to the whole Mediator, becauſe it is the great conſtituent Nature of the Mediator. Mr. *Gill*, as I think, again contradicts himſelf; for he here aſſerts, that "It is "Chriſt's being Son by Nature" that makes Jeſus ſo great an High Prieſt. And as it has before been hinted, in another Place he ſays the Eſſence or Nature of Chriſt is not begotten; which muſt prove that he is not a Son, or the begotten by Nature. Again,

1 *John* i. 7. is quoted to prove, that as Son Chriſt added *Virtue and Efficacy* to his Actions as Mediator. *The Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, his Son, cleanſeth us from all Sin.* I acknowledge with Mr. *Gill*, that the Sonſhip added Virtue to the Blood of Chriſt; but then it was no more than the Divinity in Union which added Virtue to the Death of the Man Chriſt. For as we obſerv'd before, the Second Perſon could not add Luſtre to that Action which he had a Part in; it being his Action as in Union with the Man, which made the Man's Actions glorious. The Son of God could give no Virtue or Efficacy to the mediatorial Offering, unleſs he had been a Perſon that had had no Part in it. He was the Mediator himſelf, and therefore he could only give Virtue to the Man's

immediate

immediate Act, and not to the whole Mediator being the Perſon of the Mediator himſelf. Further, Mr. *Gill* ſays, that " the Scripture " ſpeaks of it as ſomething wonderful, that he " who is the Son of God ſhould act the Part " of Mediator," for which he quotes *Heb.* v. 8. *Tho' he were a Son, yet learned he Obedience, by the things which he ſuffered.* " But where's " the Wonder, (adds Mr. *Gill*) that he being " a Mediator, ſhould act the Part of a Me- " diator?" I anſwer, there's no Wonder at all in it. But it is ſurprizingly aſtoniſhing, that a Mediator ſhould learn Obedience in order to mediate; every Mediator does not this, for thoſe they interceed for; but Jeſus Chriſt has wrought out a perfect Righteouſneſs, and on that Foundation he mediates for loſt Sinners; and that Mediation is ſo prevailing, that God the Father, if I may be allow'd the Expreſſion, *cannot refuſe it.* But the *Greek* Text bears another Tranſlation different from our *Engliſh* Verſion, we read it, *tho' he were a Son*, &c. as if there was a Wonder in it, that the Son ſhould learn Obedience; but the *Latin* Verſion tranſlates the *Greek* καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς, *& quidem cùm eſſet Filius*, which is, and *indeed ſince he was a Son, he learnt Obedience*, which ſhews that it was agreeable to the Character of the *Son* to learn Obedience, and is a Tranſlation as well warranted from other Places of Scripture as our's, if not better. But to paſs this, Mr. *Gill* tells us, that " the Wonder lies " here; that he being the Son of God, in the " Form of God, and equal with him, ſhould

" be obedient unto Death, even the Death " of the Croſs." As Mr. *Gill* applies *Son* to the eternal Second Perſon in God in that Capacity, I hope he means that the Son died in an *alluſive* Senſe, and not perſonally; I ſay this, no doubt, he will grant, or elſe *John Reeve* and *Loderick Muggleton*'s Scheme of a Regency in Heaven whilſt God dy'd, may be advanced. I'm certain Mr. *Gill* is far from this; tho' his *Words*, and confining the Son's learning Obedience, to an eternal Perſon's dying on the Croſs, do not carry an Idea to me widely different from this. " In fine (ſays he) all thoſe " Scriptures, which are deſign'd to expreſs the " Greatneſs of God's Love in the Gift and Miſ- " ſion of his Son, *&c.* do better more fully ex- " preſs it, when this Phraſe, the Son of God, " is underſtood to intend one who is a divine " Perſon, and of the ſame Nature with God, " than when it is underſtood to intend only one " who is a Servant under him." To this I reply,

1. That in the Nature of Things, a Perſon's being given by another, does certainly more ſtrongly imply his Inferiority as given, than his Co-equality in that Senſe, with him who gave him. Beſides,

2. According to Mr. *Gill*'s way of arguing, one divine Perſon in the Godhead gives another; and if Father and Son are eſſential Names to two divine Perſons, why had not the Son as much Power to give the Father, as the Father the Son? One Perſon lov'd the Elect as well as the other, and if Son is no Name of Inferiority, why could not the Son give his only

beloved

beloved Father, as the Father his only beloved Son. But God ſo loved the World, that he ſpared not his only-begotten Son; can this Son be merely an eternal Second Perſon? Who had a Power to give him as ſuch? none; he was eternally co-equal with the other two Perſons, and therefore as an eternal ſelf-exiſtent Perſon, none could give him.

Mr. *Gill* concludes his Objections againſt Chriſt's Sonſhip depending on his Mediatorſhip, with adding, "that if theſe Names * are given "to theſe three divine Perſons, on account of "their diſtinct Concern in the Oeconomy of "Man's Salvation, ſome Reaſon from thence "ought to be given, why the firſt Perſon is call'd "the Father, the ſecond the Son, and the third "the Spirit." This I promiſe to do when he, or any one elſe tells *me*, why the Perſonality of the firſt was not begotten, and the Perſonality of the ſecond was, ſince it is own'd they are both co-eternal, co-equal, and ſelf-exiſtent, and why the third's Perſonality proceeded and was not begotten. I proceed now to a ſecond Thing;

2*dly*, To take ſome Notice of Mr. *Gill*'s ſix Proofs, that "Chriſt is the Son of God, as he "is a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead."

1 *Proof.* "That Chriſt is the true and na-"tural Son of God, ſays Mr. *Gill*, and not ſo "in an improper, alluſive metaphorical Senſe, "is, I think, evident from all thoſe Paſſages of "Scripture which ſpeak of him as God's own "Son, his proper Son, the Son of himſelf, and "his only-begotten Son, &c." To this I reply, that the Terms *own*, *proper*, of *himſelf*, *only-*

* Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

begotten, &c. no more prove the Sonſhip of Chriſt, in regard only to his diſtinct divine Perſonality, than the like Terms apply'd to bodily Parts, prove that God really, as God, hath corporeal Parts; for all thoſe Terms, which Mr. *Gill* would have apply'd to Chriſt as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, are apply'd to the Arms and Hands, *&c.* of the Lord; thus *Iſa.* li. 16.—*and have covered thee in the Shadow of mine* (or my own) *Hand.* Again; as to the Term proper, it is immediately underſtood in *Job* xl. 9. *Haſt thou an Arm like God?* ſignifying that God hath an Arm proper and peculiar to himſelf. Wherefore, I think, I have as much Reaſon from theſe Terms to aſſert, that a real right Hand belongs eſſentially to God, as Mr. *Gill* has to aſſert that becauſe Chriſt is God's *proper Son*, and his *own Son*, &c. therefore he muſt be a Son only as God. But Mr. *Gill* proceeds, " that if Chriſt is the only-
" begotten Son, he muſt be ſo either as he is
" God, or as he is Man: Not as he is Man; for
" as ſuch he had no Father, and ſo was not
" begotten; wherefore he muſt be ſo as God."
I muſt here, once more anſwer Mr. *Gill* in his own Words. He tells us in the 184th Page of his Book, that " Eſſence does not beget Eſ-
" ſence." If ſo, as *God*, Chriſt cannot be the Son, for as God he was not begotten: Our God is a God by Nature or Eſſence; and if Chriſt is a Son or begotten as God, he is a Son, or begotten by his divine Eſſence; for by his divine Eſſence he is God. Wherefore it muſt either be own'd that Chriſt is not the Son or

the begotten as God, or elſe it muſt be granted, that Eſſence did beget Eſſence.

" If it ſhould be ſaid, (ſays this great Man) " that he is call'd ſo, (*i. e. Son*) becauſe of his " Conſtitution as God-man, and Mediator; it " ought to be ſhewn, that there is ſomething " in his Conſtitution as ſuch, which is at leaſt " analogous to Generation; and will furniſh " out a ſufficient Reaſon for his bearing the " Name and Character, and ſtanding in the Re- " lation of a Son to his Father."

I freely promiſe to do what Mr. *Gill here* deſires, when he, or any other ſhall ſhew me, if Chriſt is Son as God, what there is in his Conſtitution or Nature as God, when it is own'd as God he is exactly the ſame with the Perſon ſtil'd the Father, which conſtitutes *him* as God, more a *Son* than him who is call'd the Father. And as for the Analogy, it is very certain that in the God-man; in the Union of two Natures together, there is more Analogy to Generation than any Eternal Generationiſt can pretend to be in his Scheme. For what Mr. *Gill* ſays is the Agreement between carnal Generation and his hyperphifical one, as he ſtiles it, will not bear examining; for in natural Generation, like begets like, from a Communication of Properties, which I apprehend is impoſſible with God, his Attributes being *Incommunicable*; and as ſuch, if his Attributes and divine Properties be incommunicable, it is impoſſible that he ſhould beget individually a *like* to himſelf. Beſides, if *like* begets *like* in regard of God as Mr. *Gill* aſſerts, it muſt be

own'd, in my Opinion, that Eſſence begets Eſſence; for Chriſt's Likeneſs as God, with the other Perſons in the Trinity, more eſpecially lies in the Identity of Nature, he is eſſentially of the ſame individual Likeneſs with the other two Perſons. Wherefore, if Likeneſs conſiſts in Chriſt as God, in having the ſame individual Nature, and God begat his Like, God of neceſſity begat Eſſence when he begat Perſonality.

Proof 2. Mr. *Gill's* ſecond Proof that Chriſt is Son as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, runs thus: "It is eaſy to obſerve, "that Chriſt, as Son, is expreſsly call'd God; "and that the Term, *Son of God*, is us'd to "expreſs a divine Perſon." That the Term, *Son of God*, is us'd to expreſs him who is divine, I own; but then the Term *Son* has reference to him in two Capacities, or as he ſubſiſts in two Natures, and not as to one only; which Mr. *Gill's* Quotation evidently proves, which is *Heb.* i. 8. *But unto the Son, thy Throne, O God*, if taken in its due Connection with the Context. For tho' he is call'd God here, yet if this can relate diſtinctly to his divine Perſonality only, then as ſuch he has a God, for this God is expreſsly ſaid in the following Verſe to have a God, *Ver.* 8. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteouſneſs is the Scepter of thy Kingdom.* Ver. 9. *Thou* (i. e. thou Son mentioned juſt before) *haſt loved Righteouſneſs, and hated Iniquity*; therefore *God*, even thy *God*, &c. Whence it is perſpicuous, that the Son as ſuch, is ſaid to have a God, and therefore cannot ſolely, as the eternal Second

cond Perſon in the Godhead, be the Son. What follows this under Mr. *Gill*'s two Proofs from 1 *John* iii. 3. and 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. I have both in this, and in my firſt Pamphlet, I think, ſufficiently anſwer'd;* and therefore ſhall proceed,

3. Another Proof of Mr. *Gill*'s for Chriſt being Son, as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, is becauſe Chriſt aſſerts an Equality (as he ſays) as Son with the Father. *I and my Father are one.* Now I own that the Son partakes of the ſame individual Nature with the Father, but as Son he partakes another too, and therefore in the Relation of Son he muſt be inferior, as we have ſhewn in the firſt Treatiſe, by his Miſſion, his own Confeſſion, and his receiving Commands. However, what Mr. *Gill* here aſſerts, is worth our Obſervation again. He aſſerts, that the Father and Son are "not one in Perſon, but in Nature." Whence it will follow; if as the begotten Son he is *one* with the Father, not in Perſon but in Eſſence or Nature, his Eſſence or Nature is begotten, for as the begotten, or Son, he is *one* with the Father. Again, Mr. *Gill* affirms, that the Son has done and does, all that the Father has done or does. This is certainly impoſſible, unleſs it can be prov'd that as the Father, according to the Eternal Generationiſts, begat Perſonality, in like manner the Son begot Perſonality too. If this can be done then, and never till then, can it be truly and ſtrictly ſaid "the Son has "done, and does all things that his Father has

* See former Pamphlet, Pag. 29. 39, 40.

N. B. *I wou'd adviſe my Reader, if poſſible, to read Mr.* Gill's *own Book.*

"done,

" done, or does." As to making the World's raiſing the Dead, *&c.* which Mr. *Gill* inſtances, I readily own, they prove the Divinity of the Son of God, but not his Sonſhip ſimply as a divine Second Perſon. Further, Mr. *Gill* tells us that " the Son has the ſame divine Honour with " the Father." *Anſw.* As a diſtinct Perſon in God he has and ought to have, but not as he is Son, becauſe he has not, according to the Eternal Generationiſts, the divine Honour of being a Father. It is aſſerted that Father and Son are divine, eſſential Characters to firſt and ſecond Perſons as ſuch conſider'd. Whence it will follow that the Son, as he is ſaid to be perſonally and diſtinctly begotten by the firſt Perſon, cannot have the ſame individual Honour which the firſt Perſon has, becauſe the one is ſaid to have the divine eſſential Honour of being a Father, and the other that of being a Son, which are entirely diſtinct Honours.

4 *Proof.* " He was concluded by others, " to be the Son of God, not from his mediato- " rial Works and Actions, but from ſuch " Works which he performed as God, *&c.*" Suppoſe others did conclude as Mr. *Gill* and many more conclude, that Chriſt is the Son ſimply conſider'd as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, does that prove the Point? Or are their Concluſions to be a Rule for other People to conclude by? Surely, no; every one is at Liberty to judge according as he ſees, the Reaſonableneſs and Truth of a Doctrine. Beſides, it is not to be prov'd by Scripture-Revelation, that any did conclude Chriſt to be

Son, *only* as he was a diſtinct divine Perſon in God. All thoſe who with *Simeon* waited for the Meſſiah, knew that the *ſent* of God was to be God and Man, two Natures but one Perſon, which is held forth in that well known Text, *to us a Child is born, a Son is given, his Name ſhall be called wonderful, counſellor, the mighty God*, &c. And when *Nathaniel* made that ingenuous Confeſſion, which Mr. *Gill* quotes, *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God*, it is evident he view'd him both as God and Man. *Philip* had told him that they had found him of whom *Moſes* in the Law and the Prophets ſpake, Jeſus of *Nazareth*. After this *Nathaniel*, as he is approaching Jeſus, is characteriz'd, *Behold an Iſraelite*, &c. *Nathaniel* asks him how he came to know him; poſſibly *Nathaniel*, as he knew he had never ſeen Jeſus before, put this Queſtion to try whether it was as *Philip* had told him, that this was he of whom the Prophets had ſpoke, *i. e.* he wanted to ſee if Jeſus could prove himſelf to be God as well as Man, by anſwering his Queſtion; for immediately on Chriſt's telling him he ſaw him under the Fig-tree, he makes the Confeſſion —— thou art the Son of God, *i. e.* thou art ſurely him, of whom *Moſes* in the Law, and the Prophets ſpake, the very Meſſiah. By Faith he ſaw him to be God, as by his natural Eyes he ſaw him to be Man, and theſe two Convictions brought out the ingenuous Confeſſion, thou *art* the Son of God; God and Man in one Perſon. Had *Nathaniel* view'd him as Son only as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, he could

could have had no Proof from thence only, of his being the Son of God, or the promis'd Meſſiah. And our Lord himſelf ſeems to make the Angels deſcending on the Son of Man a greater Proof of his Sonſhip, or being Son of God, than his Omniſciency barely was; for, ſays he, *believeſt thou, becauſe I ſaw thee under the Figg-tree? thou ſhalt ſee greater things* (or as it may be tranſlated more agreeably to the Senſe) thou ſhalt ſee greater *Proofs* (Proofs) being as well ſupply'd as *Things*. Μείζω (δειγματα) τουτων ὀψῃ, *q. d.* thou ſhalt ſee greater Proofs of my Sonſhip, than what thou haſt now ſeen from my Omniſcience barely. It follows, *and he ſaith unto him, verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Hereafter you ſhall ſee Heaven opened, and the Angels of God aſcending and deſcending upon the Son of Man.* To me this ſeems one of Chriſt's greater Things or Proofs which he told *Nathaniel* he ſhould ſee, that he was the Son of God, than his bare Omniſciency was: However, both together, not one without the other certainly made up the Proof to *Nathaniel.* Again, what the *Jews* ſaid to Chriſt as he hung on the Croſs, *If thou be the Son of God, come down*, which Mr. *Gill* urges; meant no more than, if thou art more than a Man, or God as well as Man, *come down*, i. e. ſhew that thou haſt Power as God to take thy Body off the Croſs: And as they ſpoke to the Man, its far more probable that they view'd the Son as ſuch, as God and Man, than that they believ'd the Son to be as ſuch ſimply conſidered a diſtinct divine Perſon in the God-

head: If they did not believe that Humanity in Union with Divinity conſtituted the Son or the Meſſiah, for aſſerting of which the *Jews* crucify'd him, it was prepoſterous to the laſt degree to ſpeak to the Man, *If thou be the Son of God*, &c. But the *Jews* certainly meant no more nor leſs, than deſired him as he was then on the Croſs, having thereby a good Opportunity, to prove his being what he aſſerted, *viz.* that he was the Son of God by coming down. For ſaid the Chief Prieſts, *he truſted in God*; *let him deliver him now, if he will have him*: For he ſaid, *I am the Son of God*; and before they had ſaid, *Let him come down—and we will believe on him.* What would they believe? not that the Man was the Son of God; but that the Humanity was in Union with God, and therefore the Son of God, or the Meſſiah which was to come. So likewiſe the Centurion, when he obſerved the mighty Works which were done, immediately confeſs'd, *Truly, this was the Son of God.* What was? not the Man; but he ſaw plainly that this Man in his Perſon, was more than merely a Man, *viz.* the Son of God, God *and* Man; the true Meſſiah, whom the *Jews* expected, and no Impoſtor, as they would have it he was. For if Son of God related only to Chriſt as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, the Centurion talk'd, in my Opinion, very idly and fooliſh, to ſay of the Man that was crucify'd, *Truly, this was the Son of God.* And as the mediatorial Works were thoſe of God as well as Man, it is little to the Purpoſe for Mr. *Gill* to ſay, "That

"Chriſt

" Chriſt was concluded to be the Son of God, " not from his mediatorial Works, but from " ſuch Works which he perform'd as God;" as if the mediatorial Works were not perform'd by Chriſt as God: The Opening the Eyes of the Blind, giving Hearing to the Deaf, and raiſing the Dead, were all mediatorial Works which were predicted the Meſſiah ſhould perform; and yet every one of theſe Works were perform'd by Chriſt as God. Again; Chriſt's laying down his Body, and raiſing it again, were mediatorial Acts, or Works of the Mediator, and yet he perform'd the laſt, *viz.* raiſing the Body, as he was God.

Proof 5. " The Form of Baptiſm (ſays Mr. " *Gill*) runs *in the Name of the Father, and* " *of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Baptiſm " is a ſolemn Act of divine Worſhip, and is " not to be adminiſtred in the Name of any " but a divine Perſon. If the Term *Son* does " not expreſs the Dignity of his divine Na- " ture, which is the original Foundation of " ſuch divine Worſhip, and what gives him " Claim to it, but only his Office as Mediator; " then we are baptiz'd in the Name of two di- " vine Perſons, conſidered in their higheſt Ti- " tles and Characters, and in the Name of the " other, in his lower and inferior Title and " Character." I have hinted at this in my other Pamphlet; but to what Mr. *Gill* ſays, I reply as follows.

1. Mr. *Gill* ſuppoſes here, that the Term *Son*, expreſſes the Dignity of Chriſt's divine Nature. If ſo, his divine Nature was begotten, which

in

in another Page he denies; and ſays, "the di-
"vine Nature of the Son is no more begotten
"than the divine Nature of the Father and of
"the Holy Ghoſt." If ſo, how is it poſſible that *Son* ſhould expreſs the Dignity of his divine Nature, when his divine Nature was never begotten. This is to me as great a Myſtery as the Doctrine of *Eternal Generation* itſelf. But,

2. Mr. *Gill* ſeems (with real Submiſſion to him) to miſunderſtand the Scheme of thoſe who confine Sonſhip to Mediatorſhip; for they aſſert not, that Father and Holy Spirit are eſſential Characters, or the higheſt Titles of two divine Perſons; for *I am that I am*, and *I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy*. Self-exiſtency and Sovereignty, are far higher Titles. They aſſert, that all the three Titles relate and belong to theſe divine Perſons, as they diſtinctly bear different Parts in the Oeconomy of Man's Salvation. But,

3. Tho' it is granted, that theſe Titles are the Titles of Perſons who are truly Divine, yet it does not thence follow that they belong to them as they are divine. The Title of *Lord Chief Juſtice* belongs to a Perſon, but not as a Perſon, for he may be a Perſon without this Title.

Baptiſm is a Badge, in my Opinion, of our Chriſtian Profeſſion: And to thoſe, who are ſincere, upright Chriſtians in Heart, when baptiz'd, the being baptiz'd in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, may ſhew to the Congregation, both that they believe a Trinity

of

of Perſons in God, who bear theſe diſtinct Names, as diſtinctly concerned in their Salvation; and that *they* for themſelves believe, that God the Father is the Father of Jeſus Chriſt, and in and through him *their* Father; in the Son they believe as their Redeemer; and in the Holy Ghoſt their Comforter. But if theſe Titles are the eſſential Character of three infinite Perſons, and not of three Perſons as concerned in our Salvation, then we are baptiz'd in the Names of an infinite God as ſuch, which can never be a great Conſolation to the Perſon baptiz'd. Beſides, if Baptiſm be a Goſpel Ordinance, and is putting on an immediate outward Profeſſion of Chriſt, it is very ſtrange that the Names uſed in the Adminiſtration of the Ordinance, ſhould not be ſome way expreſſive of our God in the Relation of our Redeemer, who dy'd for us, was bury'd and roſe again for us, all which ſome aſſert is typified by Water Baptiſm. Mr. *Gill*'s ſixth Proof for Chriſt's Sonſhip as a diſtinct divine Perſon in the Godhead, runs in this wiſe; that "as the Phraſe *Son* "*of Man*, intends one that is truly Man; ſo "the Phraſe *Son of God*, muſt intend one that "is truly God." This I own, but then it muſt intend one that is truly Man as well as God, two Natures in one Perſon. Again, "If "the Meſſiah is called Son of Man, from the "Nature in which he is Man, he muſt be called "the Son of God, from the Nature in which "he is God." To this I once more reply in Mr. *Gill*'s own Words, "the divine Nature of "the Son is no more begot than that of the "Father."

" Father." If ſo, Chriſt is not the Son or begotten from the divine Eſſence, becauſe that was not begot, as Mr. *Gill* aſſerts, Pag. 183, 184, with one Remark on which I will conclude.

Eſſence is not begot, it was eternal, there was never a Period when there was not a divine Being; neither had the Perſonality of the Son (it is aſſerted by Eternal Generationiſts) any Beginning, *it* was *eternal* alſo. If ſo, the Eſſence could be no more; wherefore it might as well be begotten as Perſonality was; no, ſays Mr. *Gill*, " if Eſſence was begot, there would " be more than one Eſſence," but that does not follow, if we take Begetting to mean a Communication of Eſſence; for in natural Generation, Eſſence is certainly communicated, and yet there are not two Eſſences, but one Eſſence. Beſides, if the infinite Eſſence was not begotten with Perſonality, then Perſonality was begot without an Eſſence, and therefore as a begotten Perſon Chriſt could not be infinite, becauſe his infinite Nature was not begot. And what an exalted, refined Idea is this; of a Perſon without an Eſſence. But either as a Begotten Perſon he had an *infinite* Eſſence or a *finite* one (for he muſt have ſome Eſſence, or elſe he could not exiſt) not an infinite one, for that was not begotten, therefore he had a finite one, which will amount pretty nearly to a Proof for *Arianiſm*, viz. that the Perſon who was begotten, was not infinite. Wherefore either Eſſence did beget Eſſence, or elſe Perſonality being begot, diverſify'd the Modus of the divine Exiſtence. I have but one thing more to quote

from this great and good Man, and that is to caution People from calling my Opinion in this Pamphlet either *Socinianiſm*, or *Sabellianiſm*, for he himſelf aſſerts it to be neither in the 171, 172d Pages of his Treatiſe. His Words are theſe: "There are ſome who aſſert the "the proper Deity of the Son, and his diſtinct "Perſonality from the Father; who are nei- "ther in the *Socinian* nor *Sabellian* Scheme; "and yet think that the Terms Meſſiah, King "of *Iſrael*, and Son of God are ſynonimous. "And that the Second Perſon is called the Son "of God not merely on the account of the di- "vine Nature, but as the human Nature is in "Union with it; or as he is God-man and "Mediator." Reader, this is my Sentiment of the Matter entirely: I am therefore no *Socinian* nor *Sabellian*, according to Mr. *Gill's* own Conceſſion; and I am certainly no *Arian*, becauſe I believe a Co-eternity of the Second Perſon with the firſt beyond all Ideas of *Generation*, *ſetting up*, *Perſonality communicated*, *actual Mediatorſhip*, or any thing like it.

CHAP. III.

Texts brought to prove our Aſſertion, that Chriſt is Son of God only as Mediator.

THE Texts which prove Chriſt to be the Son of God *only* as Mediator, are many; ſo that as Dr. *Ridgley* obſerves, * "We are not "under a Neceſſity of ſtraining the Senſe of a

* Body of Divinity, Vol. I. Pag. 128.

" few Scriptures, to make them ſpeak agree-
" ably to this Notion of Chriſt's Sonſhip; but
" I think we have the whole Scriptures, when-
" ever it ſpeaks of Chriſt as the Son of God,
" as giving Countenance to this plain Senſe
" thereof; ſo that I cannot find one place, in
" the whole New Teſtament, in which Chriſt
" is called the Son of God; but it is with ſuf-
" ficient Evidence prov'd from the Context
" that it is apply'd to him as Mediator." Thus,

Matt. xxvi. 63, 64. *Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of God?* i. e. Art thou the true Meſſiah, or no? To which our Lord anſwer'd, *thou haſt ſaid*; or as Dr. *Ridgley* interprets it, " It is as " thou haſt ſaid," our Saviour owns, that as Chriſt he was the *Son* of God. For he goes on; *hereafter ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man ſitting on the right Hand of Power, and coming in the Clouds*; by which the Sonſhip is explained.

Matt. xxvii. 54. *Truly this was the Son of God*, or the Meſſiah, his known Character; which he had aſſerted before the *Jews*, and for which they crucify'd him, which was well known to the *Romans*. And this Expreſſion of the Centurion carries this plain Meaning, " Truly the Perſon whom the *Jews* have cru-
" cify'd for aſſerting his being the Meſſiah or
" Son of God, by theſe wonderful Appearances
" has prov'd himſelf to *be* ſuch; he who does
" theſe things, muſt be more than a bare Man;
" the *Jews* have put a Man to Death, but
" this Man muſt be more than merely ſuch,
" or elſe theſe wondrous Works would *never*

" be brought about; *truly he was the Son of* " *God*, i. e. God, as well as he is Man."

Luke iv. 41. When the Devils confeſs'd, *Thou art Chriſt, the Son of the Living God*; it immediately follows, when our Saviour forbid them to call him ſo, *they knew he was Chriſt*, which was certainly a Name equivalent to the *Son of God*, or why ſhould our Lord forbid them to call him ſo; but becauſe he was unwilling that the Devils ſhould then declare his being the Meſſiah. If *Son of God* had been a Name which was not underſtood to mean the ſame as *Chriſt*, our Lord would never have hindered them ſpeaking it; nor would that Reaſon why he hindered them be given; which is becauſe the Devils knew him to be Chriſt. It does not repeat the Word, they call'd him *Son*, becauſe they knew he was the *Son*, but it ſays they knew he was *Chriſt*, intimating that Chriſt and Son were Terms ſynonimous, and was as well underſtood to mean the Meſſiah as the other.

John xi. 4. Our Lord ſaid, that the Sickneſs of *Lazarus* was not unto Death, but *for the Glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorify'd*; which in the Sequel was to prove that he was the Meſſiah, God and Man, by raiſing him from the Dead. And when *Martha*'s Faith was try'd, ſhe confeſs'd, *I believe that thou art the Chriſt the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World.* Again,

Acts ix. 20, 22. *Paul*, it is ſaid, preach'd *Chriſt* in the *Synagogues*, that *he is the Son of God*, Ver. 22. *proving that this is very Chriſt*, *i. e.* proving that this *Son* of God, is the only

Mediator between God and Man, the very Meſſiah which ſhould come. If the Term *Son of God*, was not expreſſive of Mediatorſhip, or of the hypoſtatical Union, it was impoſſible that *Paul* ſhould prove that the *Son* was *very* Chriſt, becauſe he thereby muſt of neceſſity prove that in the Son as ſuch two different Natures were conſidered, becauſe in Chriſt, whom he prov'd the Son to be, two Natures human and divine are always ſuppos'd united.

John i. 29, 34. *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the Sins of the World! And I ſaw, and bare Record, that this is the Son of God*, i. e. that this Lamb or the Mediator, which taketh away the Sins of the World, as ſuch is the Son of God.

1 *Theſſal.* i. 10. *And to wait for his Son from Heaven, even Jeſus which deliver'd us from the Wrath to come.* This the Son, as Son performed; *for the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt his Son*, hath cleanſed from all Sin. Wherefore as the Son God is to come from Heaven, and hath deliver'd his People from the Wrath to come, as Son he muſt be Mediator.

2 *Cor.* i. 3. *Bleſſed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Wherefore if any Perſon in the Godhead be the Father of another, it is of the Mediator, the Second Perſon, in the Relation of a Redeemer. Father of *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

John xx. 7. *I aſcend to my Father, and your Father*, &c. This *Father* muſt be ſo related to Chriſt as Mediator; for as Man only, he had no Father, and as a diſtinct divine Perſon in

the Godhead, he could neither aſcend nor deſcend.

Coloſſ. i. 13, 14. *Chriſt* is called *God's dear Son, in whom we have Redemption through his Blood.* Wherefore God's dear Son can be no otherwiſe ſuch, but as Mediator *Immanuel*; for as ſuch only he has Blood.

Gal. ii. 20. The Apoſtle ſays, *I live by Faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himſelf for me.* Not merely as a diſtinct divine Perſon in God, but as Mediator, therefore as Mediator Chriſt is the Son of God, for as Son he gave himſelf. *Who gave himſelf for me.*

John iii. 35. After the Evangeliſt had deſcribed Chriſt the Bridegroom, by our Lord's own Words, it follows, *the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all Things into his Hands*, i. e. as Son; which could not be, if as Son he was not both God and Man; for as ſuch he is only capable of receiving, which is by Virtue of the human Nature in Union. I will conclude this Chapter with that learned and judicious Divine's Words, Dr. *Ridgley* on this Occaſion.*

1. 'When we read of the Son of God, as 'dependent on the Father, inferior and obe-'dient to him; and yet as being equal 'with him, and having the ſame divine Na-'ture, we cannot conceive of any Character 'which anſwers to all theſe Ideas of Sonſhip, 'unleſs that of Mediator. If we conſider the 'Properties of Sonſhip among Men, every one 'who ſtands in the Relation to a Father, is 'dependent on him.' In this reſpect, the Fa-

* Body of Divinity, Pag. 127, 128.

'ther

'ther is the Cauſe of the Son, and it is not like 'other Productions, for no Effect can (properly ſpeaking) be call'd a Son, but that which 'hath the ſame kind of Nature with the Father; and the Relation of Sonſhip always 'connotes Inferiority, and an Obligation to 'yield Obedience. I do not apply this in every reſpect to the Sonſhip in Chriſt, which no 'Similitude from mere Creatures, can ſufficiently illuſtrate; but his Character, as Mediator, ſeems to anſwer to it, more than any 'thing elſe that can be ſaid of him, ſince he 'has as ſuch, the ſame individual Nature with 'the Father, and is alſo inferior to, and dependent on him. As a Son, among Men, is inferior to, and dependent on his Father; and 'as the Prophet ſpeaks, *Mal.* i. 6. *honoureth 'his Father*; ſo whatever Chriſt is, as Mediator, he receives it from the Father, and in all 'that he does honoureth his Father, as he ſays, '*Joh.* viii. 49. As the whole Work of Redemption is referr'd to the Father's Glory, and 'the Commiſſion by which he acts as Mediator, 'is receiv'd from the Father, ſo, as Son, he refers all the Glory thereof to him.'

2. 'This Account of Chriſt's Sonſhip does 'not take away any Argument, by which we 'prove his Deity; for when we conſider him 'as Mediator, we always ſuppoſe him to be 'both God and Man, which is what we intend 'when we ſpeak of the Perſon of Chriſt in 'this reſpect; ſo that as God, he is equal with 'the Father, and has an equal Right to divine 'Adoration. This belongs to him as much,

'when conſidered as Mediator, as it can be 'ſuppoſed to do, if we conſider his Sonſhip in 'any other Reſpect.'

3. 'It does not take away Argument to 'prove his diſtinct Perſonality from the Fa-'ther and Holy Ghoſt, or at leaſt if it ſets aſide 'that which is taken from the Dependance of 'his Perſonality on the Father, as received 'from him by Communication, it ſubſtitutes 'another in the room of it, inaſmuch as to be 'a Mediator, is without doubt, a perſonal 'Character; and becauſe neither the Father, 'nor the Holy Ghoſt, can be ſaid to be Me-'diators, it implies, that his Perſonality is di-'ſtinct from theirs: Likewiſe his acting as 'Mediator from the Father; and the Holy 'Spirit's ſecuring the Glory which ariſes to 'him from hence, and applying the Redemp-'tion purchas'd by him, is a farther Proof of this 'Diſtinction of the Perſons in the Godhead.'

4. 'Since we conſider the Mediator as both 'God and Man, in one Perſon, we do not ſup-'poſe that Character reſpects either of theſe 'two Natures conſidered ſeparately.'

(1.) 'Not his divine Nature. 'Tis true, 'his having the ſame Nature with the Father, 'might be reckon'd by ſome, a Character of 'Sonſhip, as it contains one Ingredient in the 'common Idea we have thereof among Men, 'they, as Sons, are ſaid to have the ſame kind 'of Nature with their Fathers, ſo our Saviour's 'having the ſame individual Nature with the 'Father, might give Occaſion to ſome to no-'minate him, for that Reaſon, his Son; but

'though

'though this may be the Foundation of his 'being called God's *proper Son*, ἴδιος υἱὸς, yet 'this is not his diſtinguiſhing Character as 'Son; for it would follow from hence, that 'the Holy Ghoſt, who has the ſame Nature 'with the Father, would, for that Reaſon, be 'call'd the Son, which is contrary to the Scrip-'ture Account given of him, as proceeding 'from the Father and Son.'

(2.) 'This Character of Chriſt, as God-man, 'Mediator, does not reſpect his human Na-'ture, conſidered ſeparately from the divine.'

'This leads us to conſider the Difference 'between this Notion of his Sonſhip, and that 'which was generally aſſigned as the Reaſon of 'his being ſo call'd by the *Socinians*; theſe gene-'rally ſpeak of Chriſt, as being denominated the 'Son of God, becauſe of the extraordinary and 'miraculous Conception, or Formation of his 'human Nature in the Womb of the Virgin; 'and for this they refer to that Scripture in '*Luke* i. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon 'thee, and the Power of the higheſt ſhall over-'ſhadow thee; therefore alſo, that holy Thing 'which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called 'the Son of God.* The Senſe, in which they 'underſtand this Text is, that Chriſt is called 'the Son of God, becauſe of this extraordinary 'Event; but we cannot think that a miracu-'lous Production is a ſufficient Foundation to 'ſupport this Character, and therefore muſt 'conclude, that the Glory of Chriſt's Sonſhip 'is infinitely greater than what ariſes from 'thence; therefore, I humbly conceive, that

'that

'that Scripture is to be underſtood, with a lit-
'tle Variation of the Tranſlation, in this Senſe,
'the *Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee*, &c. *be-
'cauſe that holy Thing, which ſhall be born of
'thee, ſhall be called*, as he really is, *the Son of
'God.* That is, he is as Mediator, an extraor-
'dinary Perſon appointed to execute a glorious
'Office, the Godhead and the Manhood being
'united together, upon which Account he is
'the Son of God; and therefore it is expedient
'that the Formation of his human Nature
'ſhould be in an extraordinary manner; to
'wit, by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt.'

Again, 'There is a very wide Difference
'between our Account of Chriſt's Sonſhip
'and theirs, as taken from this Scripture, in
'that they ſuppoſe that his being called the
'Son of God, refers only to ſome Dignities
'conferred upon him, whom they ſuppoſe to
'be no more than a Man; this is infinitely
'below the Glory, which we aſcribe to him
'as Mediator, ſince their *Idea* of him as ſuch,
'how extraordinary ſoever his Conception was,
'argues him to be no more than a Creature;
'but ours, as has been obſerved, proves him
'a divine Perſon, ſince we never ſpeak of him
'as Mediator, without including both Natures.'

Thus far this excellent Writer, whoſe Words carry Evidence and Demonſtration, I ſhould think, to every humble Enquirer after divine Truths; and are ſufficient to ſtop the Babble of thoſe inconſiderate Perſons, who make an Outcry of *Sabellianiſm*, *Socianiſm*, or *Arianiſm*, againſt thoſe who deny an *Eternal Generation*

of

of Perſonality, and conſiſtently apply Sonſhip to the Mediator, at the ſame time giving the three Perſons in God all of them equal Honour and Glory. But our Happineſs on this Point, lies in this.

As their Noiſe and Reproaches are the Effects of Folly and Ignorance, being only ſubſtituted in the room of better Arguments, which in reality they are entirely deſtitute of; ſo theſe their Clamours will be ſo far from hindering the ſpreading of the Doctrine of Chriſt's true, glorious, mediatorial Sonſhip, that it will be the means of its being ſought into by thoſe who otherwiſe would never have took the Pains of enquiring into the Matter; let 'em therefore *bark* on, (for their Noiſe requires no better a Name) and they'll find whoſe Cauſe gains moſt Ground, their's by their Clamours againſt the Doctrine of Chriſt's Sonſhip only as Mediator, or the Doctrine itſelf maintain'd by Scripture and Reaſon.

CHAP. IV.

The Co-eternity and Co-equality of three divine and diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead prov'd, without ſuppoſing one perſonally to be begotten of another.

THE Myſtery of three diſtinct Perſons ſubſiſting in one undivided Eſſence, is a Doctrine made known only by divine Revelation; and is to be believ'd, purely on that Foundation. Human Reaſon is entirely inſufficient

ficient to explain this profound Arcanum; and its Attempts having ever fallen ſhort, have prov'd it ſo. For, *Who can by Searching find out God; who can find out the Almighty unto Perfection?* none: For as Dr. *Watts* ſweetly expreſſes it;

In vain our haughty Reaſon ſwells,
For Nothing's found in thee,
But boundleſs Unconceivables,
And vaſt Eternity. Hor. Lyr. p. 59.

Various have been the Attempts of Men of fruitful Genius, to explain the Trinity by Compariſons. Some have liken'd it to the threefold Life in Man, *viz.* Rational, Senſitive, and Vegetative. Others talk of three Cauſes concurring to produce the ſame Effect; ſuch as, the efficient, conſtitutive, and final Cauſe. Again; Light, Heat, and Motion, which are inſeparably united together in the *Sun*, have been brought to illuſtrate this Point; with many more of the like Nature, too tedious now to mention. But what has been the moſt deficient of ſhewing the Co-eternity and Co-equality of the three diſtinct Perſons in God, is the Doctrine we have been treating of in this Book. The eternal Father eternally begetting an eternal *Son*, and the eternal Holy Spirit eternally proceeding from the two. Which in other Words is, that one Perſon eternally communicated Perſonality to another, and from theſe two a third, *perſonally* proceeded. Now the Doctrine of the Trinity is on all Sides acknowledged to be a Myſtery,

but ſo far as any Myſtery is explain'd, ſo far its Myſteriouſneſs vaniſheth. And if Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are aſſerted to be eſſential Characters of the divine three Perſons; then, either the Myſtery is explain'd, or theſe Characters in Reality are not what they are pretended to, *viz.* eſſential; and that becauſe they will not bear that impartial Enquiry into their Meaning as every Character elſe, apply'd in Scripture to God, both do, and for ever will. Thus, *I am that I am*, proper Self-Exiſtency; *the ſame yeſterday, to-day, and for ever.* There's proper Immutability. So that it is very ſtrange, that if theſe Terms, *Father*, &c. were eſſential, that they will not bear the ſame Searching into as the others do. Wherefore, as the Holy Ghoſt, when he reveals Characters which are eſſential to God, is ſo very careful to reveal them in ſuch Terms, that all might know and underſtand his eternal Power and Godhead, it is very ſurprizing, that if the Names of Father and Son were eſſential to theſe Perſons, that the Word Eternal is not fix'd before each Character, ſeeing the Terms themſelves immediately denote Superiority and Inferiority. But certainly it is the ſafeſt way to keep to the Scripture manner of phraſing theſe Things; for if we add unto his Words, (there is the greateſt Reaſon to expect) that he will *reprove us, and we ſhall be found Liars*, As the Wiſeman obſerves, *Prov.* xxx. 6. Is it not the ſafeſt way, to take the Terms as laid down in *Revelation*, without ſupplying our uſeleſs Expletives, which do nothing but hurt the Cauſe we are defending? If the *Son* is never

never call'd the *Eternal Son*, how dare ſinful Man pretend to give him the Title? Had we not far better reſt ſatisfy'd with proving that the Perſons who ſuſtain theſe Characters Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are Eternal from a Neceſſity of Nature, without aſſerting that the Terms and Relations *Father*, *Son*, &c. are eternal too? That there are three diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead, is eaſily prov'd from the diſtinct Works which the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit bear in the Salvation of Mankind. But I ſhall not here pretend to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity againſt either the *Sabellians* or *Arians*; *great* and *learned Men* have done it for me many a time. All *my* Buſineſs is to ſhew that a Trinity of diſtinct Perſons in God, and their Co-equality may be prov'd without ſuppoſing one *perſonally* to be begotten, *&c.* And here I ſhall take Notice,

1. Of the Relation, which the Scripture gives of the Oeconomy ſubſiſting among the three that bear Record in Heaven; whereby their diſtinct Perſonality, as well as beautiful Order will evidently appear.

2. We ſhall take Notice of the manifeſt Scripture Proofs, that theſe three Perſons are co-eternal and co-equal.

The firſt Perſon in the Trinity, call'd the *Father*, as ſuch is conſider'd;

1. As the Donor of all the Bleſſings, which Believers partake of in Chriſt Jeſus, *Epheſ.* i. 3. *Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who hath bleſs'd us with all ſpiritual Bleſſings in heavenly Places in Chriſt.*

2. The

2. The Father is repreſented as the Chuſer of our Perſons in Chriſt, *Epheſ.* i. 4. — *according as he* (i. e. the Father) *hath choſen us in him before the Foundation of the World.*

3. He is repreſented as the Sender of Chriſt Jeſus into the World, on his own ſpecial Commands. As our Saviour himſelf informs us, when he ſays—*even as I have kept my Father's Commandments, and abide in his Love.* Now, was *Father* an eſſential Character of the firſt Perſon, he muſt be eſſentially diſtinct from the other two.

1. As *Father*; none being a Father but one, and therefore none has that Glory peculiarly but him. Now a *Father* and *Son* are certainly two diſtinct Properties; whence it will follow, that if Father be an eſſential Character, the firſt Perſon has an eſſential Property as God, which belongs not to the Second Perſon. Either this muſt be own'd, or elſe *to beget* in one Perſon, is the ſame as *to be begotten* in the other.

2. If *Father* be an eſſential Character, then as the Father does act in that Capacity, diſtinctly from the Son, he muſt have from his Actions a diſtinct Glory ariſing which the Son has not; yea, he muſt have a quite different Glory. For as Father he *chuſes*, *bleſſes*, &c. which the Son in his Capacity does not; wherefore the firſt Perſon's being a Father, muſt relate to the Oeconony of Man's Salvation in which alone he can receive different Honours, and diſtinct from the other Perſons. The *Son*, in his Capacity as Son, acts diſtinctly and differently. Alſo,

1. He

1. He is the Sponſor and Surety of his People; he has receiv'd an elect Number from the Father's Hands, as he himſelf acknowledges, *John* xvii. 6. *Thine they were, and thou gaveſt them me*; and all theſe which the Father hath given him he has expreſsly promis'd ſhall come.

2. The Son is the Father's Embaſſador; *in the Fulneſs of Time God ſent forth his Son.* And *Gal.* iv. 4. and he is the Object of the Father's Love. *John* v. 20. for *the Father loveth the Son*, and as a Conſequence of this Love, he *ſheweth him all Things that himſelf doth.*

3. The Son acts as Judge, commiſſion'd by the Father, *John* v. 22. *All Judgment is committed into the Son.* He has the Honour of being Judge diſtinctly from the Father, and therefore as Son, having in that Capacity a different Honour from the Father, he cannot be merely and ſimply a divine Second Perſon in the Godhead, but muſt be the Mediator, in which Relation he can alone receive an Honour, which the Father does not. Again; the Holy Ghoſt in *his* Capacity has diſtinct and different Parts of acting.

1. The particular Work of Regeneration is apply'd to the Holy Spirit; *the Wind bloweth where it liſteth, and ye hear the Sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth; ſo is every one that is born of the Spirit*, John iii. 8.

2. The Work of Sanctification is particularly apply'd to the Holy Ghoſt; *but ye are waſh'd, but ye are ſanctify'd — by the Spirit of our God*, 1 Cor. vi. 11. and Rom. xv. 16. — *being ſanctify'd by the Holy Ghoſt.*

3. The

3. The Holy Spirit acts as a Comforter, and is ſent by the Father in Chriſt's Name to his People, *John* xxiv. 26. *But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt,—he ſhall teach you all Things.* Whence I think it is manifeſt, that theſe Characters and Offices which are very diſtinct as *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, which are apply'd to God, belong to three ſeveral Perſons, and are not Relations of one Perſon. Since to be *ſent*, *to comfort*, *redeem*, &c. are Terms which *cannot* be apply'd to an Office: And tho' theſe Characters are not eſſential to the Perſons to whom they belong, as they are conſider'd ſimply in the Godhead; yet,

2*dly*, The Eternity and Co-equality of the proper Divinity of theſe three Perſons, may very eaſily be prov'd from manifeſt and expreſſive Texts of Scripture, divine Attributes being immediately apply'd to them; and ſuch as can never be given to a mere Creature, *viz.* Self-exiſtency and Eternity, Omniſciency, Omnipreſcency, and Omnipotency. I need not go about to prove that the Perſon ſtil'd *Father* is truly divine, becauſe it is generally granted on all Sides; wherefore we ſhall manifeſtly ſhew that the above Attributes are apply'd to the Perſons who are called *Son*, and *Spirit*.

1. Then, Eternity is aſcrib'd to the Perſons who bear the Relations of Son, and Holy Spirit. *Rev.* i. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, who was, and is, and is to come.* And *Heb.* vii. 3. *Having neither Beginning of Days, nor End of Life.* Theſe are apply'd to the Son.

The Spirit is ſaid to be eternal. *Heb.* ix. 9.— *Who thro' the eternal Spirit.* —

2. *Omniſciency* is likewiſe aſcrib'd to both theſe Perſons. (1.) To the Son, *Joh.* ii. 24, 25. *But Jeſus did not commit himſelf unto them, becauſe he knew all Men* (thoſe abſent, as well as preſent) and *needed not that any ſhould teſtify of Man, for he knew what was in Man.* Again, *John* xxi. 17 — *and he ſaid unto him, Lord, thou knoweſt all Things.* (2.) To the Spirit, Omniſciency is apply'd, 1 *Cor.* ii. 10.— for the Spirit *ſearcheth all Things, yea, the deep Things of God*; a Thing abſolutely impoſſible, if he was not omniſcient.

3. Theſe two Perſons are omnipreſent. (1.) The Son himſelf ſays, *Lo, I am with you always even unto the End of the World.* (2.) The Spirit is by the Pſalmiſt very ſtrongly proved to be omnipreſent, *Pſalm* cxxxix. 7, 8, 9 Verſes. *Whither ſhall I go from thy Spirit?* To which he very beautifully anſwers, that whether he is in Heaven, Earth, or Hell, he is not abſent from this Spirit. The proper Divinity of theſe two Perſons might farther be prov'd by their *Names*, *Works*, and *Honours*. But I think what I have writ, may ſuffice to ſhew my firm Belief of the proper Divinity, *Of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* And I think this way of proving the Doctrine of Trinity in Unity is far more eligible, than going upon this Point, by aſſerting one perſonally to be begotten, or to have his Perſonality communicated, *&c.* By doing of

which, we certainly embarraſs ourſelves with inſurmountable Difficulties. Whilſt we prove Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be diſtinct Characters and Relations of diſtinct Perſons, all that is neceſſary to be done, is to ſhew that theſe Perſons have divine Attributes ſeverally apply'd to them, which tho' it will not prove the Eternity of the Relations, yet it will certainly prove the true Divinity of the Perſons. In fine, this way of treating the Doctrine, is preferable to the other for two very ſubſtantial Reaſons.

1. Becauſe it is free'd from thoſe Incumbrances, which lay on thoſe who aſſert Perſonality to be begotten and communicated, to prove a Co-equality, on this Suppoſition.

2. Becauſe it gives to one Perſon in the Trinity, the ſame individual Honour as a divine Perſon, as it does to another, which can never be done on the other Scheme, it being an Honour peculiar to one Perſon to beget, and an Honour to another to be begotten, which muſt be two different Honours; unleſs the *Eternal Generationiſts* can prove, that to be *begotten* by one, is the ſame as to *beget* in another; as was obſerv'd before. And to conclude; this way of treating the Doctrine of a Trinity of Co-equal and co-eternal Perſons in the divine Eſſence (which is certainly a Doctrine inexplicable) more evidently acknowledges this divine Myſtery, than the *Eternal Generation Scheme* does, in as much as the Terms *Father* and *Son*, &c. carry an Idea entirely remote from Co-eternity and Co-equality. Whereas

the Scheme we have now been advancing, both proves the proper Divinity and diſtinct Perſonality of Three in One; and at the ſame time gives the right and genuine Meaning to the Titles or Names, *Father* and *Son*; which on the other Hand are apply'd without an Explanation of their due Signification, *when* thus apply'd, to two infinite, eternal, ſelf-exiſtent Perſons, as ſuch ſimply conſider'd. I would always own the Myſtery of Three in One, without ſuffering myſelf to ask, *how?* and therefore I conclude all with ſix Verſes out of Dr. *Watts*'s inimitable Lyrics, and with one Word of Advice to any who may think it worth while to defend *Eternal Generation.*

The Doctor thus beautifully ſings:

I.

" Stand and adore how glorious He,
" That dwells in bright Eternity!
" We gaze, and we confound our Sight,
" Plung'd in th'Abyſs of daz'ling Light.

II.

" Thou Sacred *One*, Almighty THREE,
" Great Everlaſting MYSTERY,
" What lofty Numbers ſhall we frame
" Equal to thy tremendous Name?

III.

" Seraphs, the neareſt to the Throne,
" Begin, and ſpeak the great UNKNOWN.
" Attempt the Song, wind up your Strings,
" To Notes untry'd, and boundleſs Things.

IV. You

IV.

" You whoſe capacious Pow'rs ſurvey,
" Largely beyond our Eyes of Clay:
" Yet what a narrow Portion too
" Is ſeen, or known, or thought by you?

V.

" How flat your higheſt Praiſes fall
" Below th'immenſe ORIGINAL!
" Weak Creatures we, that ſtrive in vain
" To reach an uncreated ſtrain!

VI.

" Great God, forgive our feeble Lays,
" Sound out thine own Eternal Praiſe;
" A Song ſo vaſt, a Theme ſo high,
" Calls for the Voice that tun'd the Sky.

My Word of Advice to thoſe who thinking themſelves able to defend *Eternal Generation*, may perhaps give me an Anſwer, is that of *Horace*'s to Poets.

Sumite materiam veſtris qui ſcribitis æquam
Viribus & verſate diu quid ferre recuſent,
Quid valeant Humeri.— Hor. de Art. Poet.

F I N I S.

BRITISH
MUSEUM